

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER
AND
RELIGIOUS MISCELLANY.

JULY, 1856.

ART. I.—THE PROGRESSIVE FRIENDS.*

THE secession from the Friends which has taken the above name in Pennsylvania, New York, and Ohio, has become sufficiently important to deserve notice. There is also something interesting in the fact of this development of Quakerism on its reformatory and progressive side.

The early Quaker movement was an extraordinary one. Consider how much it included in itself. It was the most radical enterprise ever yet undertaken,—a rebellion without parallel against Church and State. It was at once a spiritual movement, aiming at a loftier piety,—a theological movement, seeking a broader creed,—a reform movement, aiming at the overthrow of war, slavery, and public evils,—a social movement, seeking to inaugurate a better mode of life.

It would be easy, were it necessary, to justify this

* 1. *Minutes and Proceedings of the Green-Plain Yearly Meeting of Friends, who have adopted the Congregational Order of Church Government.* 1849–1851.

2. *Address to Friends of Genesee Yearly Meeting.* 1848.

3. *Proceedings of Annual Meeting of Congregational Friends, Waterloo, N. Y.* 1849, 1850, 1851, 1852, 1853.

4. *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Friends of Human Progress, Waterloo, N. Y.* 1854 and 1855.

5. *Proceedings of Pennsylvania Yearly Meeting of Progressive Friends.* 1854 and 1855.

statement with ample proofs, taken from the writings of the early Friends. The spiritual character of their system showed itself in their doctrine of the inward light. Like the mystics of every age and every church, like William Law and Madame Guion, like Erigena and St. Bernard, like Bonaventura, Tauler, and Gerson, they taught a substantial and immediate communion with God; they believed that religion consists in the immanence of God in the soul, and religious faith in recognizing this immanence. Dissatisfied both with the formalism of the Church of England and the dogmatism of the Puritans, the founder of Quakerism sought for a more substantial and interior religion through a direct communion with God, for which the mediation of the Church and the creed were not essential. Barclay says, that "where the true inward knowledge of God is, through the revelation of his Spirit, there is all; neither is there an absolute necessity of any other." This faith in the constant presence of the Comforter in the soul created a piety more vital and profound than that of the surrounding churches. But it naturally led at once to a reformed theology. The new Life in the soul was also a new Light. Every doctrine of the Church was attacked by it; for though the Friends did not make it their direct aim to reform theology, this was a natural consequence of their fundamental principle. It modified their view of human depravity, of the atonement, of the Trinity. In practical affairs, the Quaker movement immediately showed itself as a very radical reform. It attacked all social customs. It refused to take oaths, and so seemed to shake the foundation of society as upheld by government and united by law. It rejected public worship of the usual sort, renounced baptism and the Lord's Supper, denied the duty of keeping the Sabbath, rejected a clergy as a class distinguished from the laity, and so seemed to shake the foundations of the Christian Church. It refused to conform to social usages of dress and address, kept on its hat in the presence of dignitaries, said Thee and Thou, and thus displeased the whole community. It refused to fight, would pay no tax for the support of war, and so seemed to renounce patriotism and the defence of one's country. Before there was any Antislavery Society, the Quaker,

preached against slavery; before there was any Prisoner's Friend Society, he sought to abolish capital punishment and imprisonment for debt; before there was a Peace Society, he renounced war; before there was a Woman's Rights Society, he placed woman on a level with man, and called on them to speak in his meeting, and to preach in public. Thus radical and broad was the movement of the early Quakers. It really involved in itself almost every subsequent reform.

But however free the first movement of any religious sect or party may be, it is apt very soon to stiffen and harden into a routine. That which was first done from an inward impulse, continues to be done as a matter of form. By and by the body which at first rejoiced in its individual character, and loved its separate existence, begins to desire to be again like others. Of late years the Quakers in England and the United States have cultivated Orthodoxy. Many of them, receding from the early doctrine of their founders, conform much more nearly to the popular theology in regard to the inspiration of the Bible, the Trinity, and the atonement. This naturally led to a reaction in the opposite direction. The movement of Elias Hicks turned more particularly upon the question of the Trinity and Unity, but presently led to other things, and among the rest to the progressive religious movement of which we have now to speak. Originating with the Hicksite Friends, it now embraces many persons hitherto belonging to other sects and to no sect, who have associated together on a pretty distinctly defined platform of perfect freedom of religious opinion, and united action in regard to personal improvement and active usefulness. From a gentleman connected with the body from the first, we have the following account of its origin.

"The whole matter may be summed up in a few words. The Friends, like every other sect, have been divided in spirit into two classes, viz. : — 1. The Conservatives, the ruling party, — those who strenuously resisted all radical changes; who glorified the fathers, adhering more closely to the letter than to the spirit of their works; who compromised the former testimonies of the Society against slavery, and resisted by all possible means the antislavery movement, and other and kindred efforts for the amelioration of popular customs, laws, and institutions. 2. The

Reformers, — more especially the Antislavery Reformers, — who struggled earnestly to assist the Society in practical labors for the overthrow of slavery. The latter, in many cases, were made to feel the rod of ecclesiastical proscription and outlawry. Conservative Quaker preachers denominated Abolitionists as irreligious and worldly men, whose purpose it was to destroy the ancient landmarks. The disownment of Isaac T. Hopper (see his *Life* by Mrs. Child), and of that sweet-spirited and deeply religious man, Charles Marriott, in New York, for the offence of belonging to the American Antislavery Society, may be taken as an example of what was done by the rulers in the Quakers' Israel in different parts of the country. The said rulers maintained that the Quakers were a 'select people,' and that it was a violation of the spirit, if not the letter, of the Discipline, for members to unite with those not Friends in works of charity and reform. They were allowed, however, without molestation, to join political parties, and such benevolent associations as brought fame and reputation to the Society. The rule was applied only to those who went into *unpopular* reforms. The contest between these parties went on, until the Reformers were compelled to choose between dishonorable submission to ecclesiastical tyranny, and the organization of new associations. The form of organization which prevailed among the Friends afforded many facilities for the exercise of despotic authority. The Yearly Meetings have full power over the Discipline, and to them the Quarterly Meetings were held directly responsible, while the Monthly Meetings, in their turn, were answerable to the Quarterly.

"The first movement for a new organization was made by the Friends of Green-Plain Quarterly Meeting, in Ohio. This meeting was a part of the Indiana Yearly Meeting, which brought the whole weight of its power upon it to compel submission. The Reformers constituted a very large majority of this Quarterly Meeting, and, thus pressed, they took refuge in a new organization, framing it upon Congregational principles, — that is, giving each local congregation full power to manage its own affairs, and holding larger meetings only for good fellowship and union in philanthropic and religious objects. This meeting was formed, I think, in 1848, and its name and style was 'Green-Plain Yearly Meeting of Friends who have adopted the Congregational Order of Church Government.' Owing to extensive emigration to the West, this meeting is now extinct, though some of the local congregations sympathizing therewith yet remain.

"Next in order comes the Waterloo Yearly Meeting of Congregational Friends.

"Next is the Ohio Yearly Meeting, formed in 1852.

"The Michigan Yearly Meeting was next formed.

"The Pennsylvania Yearly Meeting of Progressive Friends, though the youngest, is yet the most numerous and efficient of all."

One of the features of this movement, it will be seen, is that it has adopted a Congregational principle of church government. This is significant of a tendency which showed itself in England and America in the seventeenth century, as one of the first results of the second Reformation. Papacy, Episcopacy, Presbyterianism, and Congregationalism are, in the Church, the same things that Royalty, Aristocracy, Republicanism, and Democracy are in the State. But the seventeenth century was not ready for this form of government, and consequently there has been a long reaction in the Protestant Church in favor of less democratic institutions. The first, or Protestant Reformation, did not tend to Congregationalism, but rather to Episcopacy; — in England being pure Episcopacy; in the Lutheran Church, a mixture of Episcopacy and Presbyterianism; in Sweden and Denmark, a system varying very little from the Roman Catholic, except in the absence of the Pope. But the second, or Puritan Reformation, tended to Presbyterianism, or the government of the Church by the whole body of the clergy. In this system the laity have scarcely any influence, and it is a church of the clergy rather than of the people. But Congregationalism, in its strict form, does not recognize the distinction between the clergy and the laity. The Cambridge Platform declares that "there may be the essence and being of a church without any officers." Ordination, according to this Platform, is not a sacrament conferring any spiritual character. "We account it nothing else," says the Cambridge Platform, "but the solemn putting a man into his place and office in the church whereunto he had right before by election." It declares that "imposition of hands may be performed by the brethren"; "for if they may elect officers," it says, "which is the greater, and wherein the substance of the office doth consist, they may much more impose hands in ordination, which is less, and but the accomplishment of the other." Thus they gave to each church the power of continuing its

own existence, which it could have on no other principle, and struck at the root of the principle of Sacramental Succession. To complete their work, they ordained that a man ceasing to be an officer of a particular church *ceased to be a clergyman*, and had no right to perform an official act until regularly chosen for another church, in which case he ought to be again ordained. By this declaration, the whole distinction between clergy and laity was struck away. But the Congregational churches have not acted up to this, their own principle, but have always had as much of a clergy as other churches. They have, however, maintained the independent principle of church government, although they have not succeeded in extending its domain, since the beginning of the eighteenth century. But we may be sure of this,—that whenever a body arises in the Church seeking a broader activity, it will pretty certainly plant itself on the Congregational principle of church government. It must necessarily do so in order to escape the oppressive tendencies and the narrow spirit which come from an authoritative union of churches. Such, therefore, was the action of the Friends who, in New York and Ohio, took the name of Congregational Friends, but who now are generally known as Progressive Friends. But the main point of their testimony is in behalf of various moral and social reforms, or applied Christianity.

The idea which the Progressive Friends have in view appears very plainly in the annual reports which now lie before us of the New York Yearly Meetings for eight years back, the Pennsylvania Yearly Meeting for the last three years, and the Ohio Yearly Meeting. All of them contain testimonies in regard to Temperance, Slavery, the Rights of Woman, Amusements, War and Peace, the Treatment of Criminals, the Use of Tobacco, and the like. They are in correspondence with distinguished persons in different parts of the country, whose letters are printed in these reports. They appear to be well provided with zeal and earnestness in behalf of their ideas. Their Yearly Meetings are well attended, and they have the ardor of a new people.

This body of Progressive Friends is trying a great experiment, namely, Can a Christian denomination exist without a distinct theology of any kind? And again,

Can a Christian denomination take an active part in the different reforms of the day? The experiment is certainly worth trying. For our own part, we do not believe in the necessity of a fixed theology in a church. There must, no doubt, be some *common conviction* as the basis of union; there must be some central belief, and some standard to which to appeal. Roman Catholics have the Bible and Tradition, and an Infallible Church to decide what these teach. Protestants have the Bible, and the Creed, and a majority in the church, to decide what these mean. Unitarians have the Bible, and each man's reason to decide what it teaches. But these Friends go a step farther, and take all nature and history as the source of truth, and individual reason as its rule. Now this may well constitute a church of seekers and students; but how is it as regards a church of believers? Can such a church be said to have any belief at all? and if no belief, can they be a teaching church in any sense? How can those teach who have nothing to say? And if they have nothing to teach, have they any evangelical or missionary character? have they any gospel,—any method by which to save the souls of men? Have they, in fact, anything to do except to discuss and debate? In reply to this, the Progressive Friends would doubtless say, We are more of a missionary church than any other, more evangelical than any other; for our mission is to carry to the world practical Christianity; we preach a gospel of practical goodness. But the question returns, *What* goodness? *what* practical Christianity? Practical measures are based on speculative ideas; there can be no union as to practice where there is not first a union as to principle. There may be a temporary union which shall agree to oppose intemperance and slavery. But how does it follow that a man who is willing to act with others against slavery, shall also be willing to act with them against the use of tobacco? Does it follow that, because a man is opposed to capital punishment, he shall also be in favor of the rights of woman? For a time men may be led by their interest in leading reformers to follow them into the various reforms which they advocate. But evidently, unless it can be shown that there is a clear connection among them all, there

must soon be a divergence of action, because there will soon come a difference of opinion. Even in the Anti-slavery movement, how many sects there are agreeing in the end, but differing as to the means. There is the party of Mr. Garrison, who hold the Constitution of the United States to be a pro-slavery document; and who think, that, by supporting it, and even by voting under it, they are supporting slavery, and who therefore demand a dissolution of the Union. Then there is the party headed by Gerritt Smith, which believes the Constitution to be an antislavery instrument, and that it is the duty of Congress to abolish slavery in the slaveholding States. And thirdly, there is the Republican party, who believe the Constitution a mixed instrument, which is in the main antislavery, but in some particulars pro-slavery, — which does not think it has a right to abolish slavery in the Slave States, but thinks it ought to be abolished by the general government in the Territories. Now, if these three parties are unable to work together, when they have the same end, how can it be expected that a body can remain united who have so many different objects in view?

One way of obviating this difficulty, and the most obvious way, is to have it made a condition of union with the body, that one shall be willing to do, or to abstain from doing, certain things. Instead of making it a condition of admission into the church, that one shall hold certain opinions, the condition would be, that one should do certain actions. But this test of fellowship is more objectionable than is belief of doctrines. The creed will often slumber in the church, doing no one any harm; but this practical test would interfere very unfavorably with Christian liberty, and would put a stop to Christian progress. It is evident that any such condition of membership would be in fact a creed. The Pennsylvania Yearly Meeting, in its invitation for 1855, says that "the chief characteristic of the Progressive Friends is, that they prescribe no system of theological belief as a test of membership." But to require those who join them to unite with them in opposition to slavery, intemperance, war, capital punishment, the denial of the equal rights of woman, &c., is to prescribe a system of ethical belief as a test of membership. In

its invitation for this year it says, "The Progressive Friends have no creed as the basis of association." Last year, the Pennsylvania Yearly Meeting adopted a memorial to Congress, requesting it to take immediate steps for the abolition of the army and navy. There are those who are opposed to war, and who believe in human brotherhood, but who do not think it right to abolish the army and navy. No doubt such persons would be admitted members of this body; and thus the resolutions adopted would represent, not the sentiments of the body, but of the majority of the body. But if this majority was thoroughly in earnest, it would hardly tolerate opposition to any of its practical measures, and those who differed with it must either be silent or must leave the body. But this would conflict with the principle which they evidently hold very dear, — the principle of individual freedom. They say, in their exposition of sentiments for 1855: "As a Yearly Meeting, we disclaim all disciplinary authority, whether over individual members or local associations. We shall, from time to time, declare our sentiments on such subjects as may demand our attention; but they will be armed with no other force than that which our moral influence may impart." But this would have only the weight which belongs to the resolutions adopted by the majority of a convention, and we all know how small is the influence coming from such a testimony. Witness the resolutions adopted year after year by the Legislatures of the States, which are forgotten almost before they are printed; witness the resolutions adopted at the meetings of political parties, intended merely for use at the next election. The great difficulty is to combine individual freedom of opinion in any religious or philanthropic association with any active, practical purpose. If a church or a society is to unite merely for speculative objects, if it is to be merely a meeting for discussion, there may no doubt be perfect freedom there. But as soon as it wants to do anything, it finds it impossible to tolerate difference of opinion within itself. Thus it would be hard for the American Antislavery Society to retain among its active members those who believed in the Constitution and the Union. It would be hard for the Peace Society, after it had decided to oppose *all*

war, to allow those who still believe in defensive war to take part in its affairs. A temperance society, desiring to make men sign a pledge of total abstinence, could not allow those who thought it best for men to drink light wines to co-operate at its meetings. For as fast as the society did its work of producing conviction, so fast would these dissenting brothers undo that work again.

These are the difficulties which lie in the way of every association that wishes to combine free thought and philanthropic action. The difficulty exists only as regards associations, not as regards individuals. An individual can think freely on every subject, and, when he wishes to act, can join the particular association with which he agrees. He may be radical as regards slavery, very conservative as regards woman's rights; — on the question of war, he may agree with the ultra party, and be a non-resistant; but as regards temperance, he may belong to those who think it right to drink in moderation. All he has to do is to think for himself, and when he wishes to act, to join the special sect with which he agrees. When he has joined the philanthropic association, he has indeed renounced, for the time he belongs to it, his freedom of opinion; but only on that particular subject, and while he remains a member.

Here seems to be the difficulty. We shall rejoice with all our hearts if this society shall succeed in solving the problem which we have suggested. We, too, have longed to see a church which should be at once practical and progressive; which should be liberal without being lukewarm; which should take up every question of humanity, not merely for investigation and discussion, but also for action. We too have longed to see a religious union within which the mind should be constantly stimulated to new thought and the freest inquiry, in which the heart should be fed by prayer and the outpouring of the deepest spiritual experience, and in which shoulder should be placed firmly to shoulder, and hand grasped strongly in hand, in the closest union for all Christian uses. Conflict of thought, communion of heart, co-operation in action, — this is what we need to realize. If the Progressive Friends will help us to realize this, we shall heartily thank them. But it is necessary

that the difficulty should be distinctly seen in its full extent, before we can hope to overcome it.

We hope that the Progressive Friends will go forward in their undertaking, and plant everywhere small local associations, which shall meet together for purposes of piety and charity, and send delegates every year to the General Yearly Meeting. We believe in trying. Speculation concerning the Church is good, but edification is better. The exposition of sentiments for 1855 says well, "We must build, as well as destroy." We are satisfied that destructive reform is a poor thing, as surely it is a very easy thing, when compared with that which is constructive. Accordingly, we desire to see encouragement and aid given to all such enterprises as the one before us.

J. F. C.

ART. II. — THE PHYSICAL GEOGRAPHY OF THE SEA.*

WHEN President John Quincy Adams, in his first message to Congress, proposed an appropriation for the establishment of a National Observatory, the occasion was eagerly seized by party spirit to charge a foredoomed administration with extravagant and unconstitutional views. The very language of the chief magistrate was criticised by a taste sharpened by hostility; and the expression "light-houses of the skies" was repeated far and wide in tones of contempt.

Years passed by, and the structure for proposing which the President had been so severely blamed, was erected at the suggestion of one of his successors, without discussion in Congress, and without even the knowledge, on the part of that august assembly, of what they were doing. The administration modestly asked for a building to accommodate certain charts and instruments. The necessary appropriation was made, and the building rose. It was surmounted by that peculiar dome,

* *The Physical Geography of the Sea.* By M. F. MAURY, LL. D., Lieut. U. S. Navy. Third Edition, enlarged and improved. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1855. 8vo. pp. 287.

proportioned rather to the demands of science than to those of architectural grace, which marks the "light-house of the skies," as the lantern does that of the ocean. The endowment of the institution presented no difficulty. Of course, persons must be employed to take care of the "charts and instruments." As the observatory had been erected under the name of a Depository of Charts, so was a philosopher worthy of the trust employed to superintend it, under the disguise of a "Lieut. U. S. Navy."

Singular as this history is, it is not less strange that a board of officers from the same navy that is honored by Lieutenant Maury's talents, should have proposed to place that officer on a "retired list," as if his place at Washington, instead of being one of most useful and honorable labor, were one of indolent withdrawal from the service of his country. Well has the injustice been rebuked by the general voice.

We have, in the work before us, a portion of the results of this distinguished officer's labors, in a department of natural science connected with his profession as a sailor. Some of the details of those results are embodied in the "Wind and Current Charts" of the same author; while a corps of hundreds of observers in national and commercial vessels, are carrying on their investigations for the better understanding of the subject,—all under the guidance of the "Lieutenant in the Navy" who has charge of the "charts and instruments" at Washington.

We have selected this volume for comment, not only as interesting in itself and honorable to American science, but because of its connection with religion. Breathing throughout a spirit of deep reverence to the Creator, whose "wonders in the deep" are its theme, it displays those wonders in a manner so clear and so striking, that it seems impossible for an unprejudiced mind not to be impressed and elevated by the contemplation.

The subject first spoken of in the work is "The Gulf Stream," and the first chapter opens with a striking description of that remarkable current.

"There is a river in the ocean. In the severest droughts it never fails, and in the mightiest floods it never overflows. Its banks and its bottom are of cold water, while its current is of

warm. The Gulf of Mexico is its fountain, and its mouth is in the Arctic Seas. It is the Gulf Stream. There is in the world no other such majestic flow of waters. Its current is more rapid than the Mississippi or the Amazon."

The question of the cause of the Gulf Stream is ably discussed, and decided on strong evidence. The different degree of saltness in the torrid zone and in the temperate regions, and the diurnal motion of the earth, are, by reasoning at once ingenious and clear, shown to be among the principal causes of this wonderful ocean river.

The second chapter discusses the influence of the Gulf Stream upon climate. Most ingeniously and strikingly is this influence illustrated. A few quotations will exhibit at once the grandeur of Lieutenant Maury's theme, and the religious spirit in which it is investigated.

"As the waters in these two caldrons" (the Caribbean Sea and the Gulf of Mexico) "become heated, they are borne off by the Gulf Stream, and are replaced by cooler currents through the Caribbean Sea; the surface water, as it enters here, being 3° or 4°, and that in depth 40° cooler than when it escapes from the Gulf. Taking only this difference in surface temperature as an index of the heat accumulated there, a simple calculation will show that the quantity of specific heat daily carried off by the Gulf Stream from those regions, and discharged over the Atlantic, is sufficient to raise mountains of iron from zero to the melting point, and to keep in flow from them a molten stream of metal greater in volume than the waters daily discharged from the Mississippi River. Who, therefore, can calculate the benign influence of this wonderful current upon the climate of the South? In the pursuit of this subject, the mind is led from nature up to the Great Architect of nature; and what mind will the study of this subject not fill with profitable emotions? Unchanged and unchanging alone, of all created things, the ocean is the great emblem of its everlasting Creator. 'He treadeth upon the waves of the sea,' and is seen in the wonders of the deep. Yea, 'He calleth for its waters, and poureth them out upon the face of the earth.'" — pp. 49, 50.

The influence of the Gulf Stream is felt in the West of Europe, which is washed by its spent waters, producing there a climate much more mild than that of the corresponding shores of this continent. Says our author:—

"Every west wind that blows crosses the stream on its way to Europe, and carries with it a portion of this heat to temper there the northern winds of winter. It is the influence of this stream upon climate that makes Erin the 'Emerald Isle of the Sea,' and that clothes the shores of Albion in evergreen robes; while in the same latitude, on this side, the coasts of Labrador are fast bound in fetters of ice." — pp. 48, 49.

In the third chapter, on "The Atmosphere," the wonderful system is described by which the winds, the messengers of Divine Power, convey the fertilizing clouds from zone to zone. This subject, further pursued in the subsequent chapters, is one of the most suggestive of religious thought. It sometimes creates a feeling of wonder, to look on an artificial representation of the globe, and observe how great is the portion of its surface given to the ocean. Is it not strange, we say, that, since man is the noblest of God's creatures here, that part of the globe which is adapted to his residence should be comparatively so small, — that about three fourths of the world should be overspread by the ever-moving mass of waters, on whose mighty bosom man can, by the highest achievements of his mind, hold but a temporary and perilous existence? Look on the vast expanse of the Pacific, stretching for ten thousand miles from continent to continent; — does it not appear, says human presumption, that another continent yet might well have divided those waters, and furnished a home for millions more of human beings than the earth can now sustain? To such an inquiry it is the privilege of Science to reply, and therein to exercise her noblest office,

"And vindicate the ways of God to man."

But for that wide and seemingly useless expanse of ocean, the land itself would be uninhabitable. That is the grand reservoir from which proceed those supplies of moisture, which, rising at first in exhalations, then wafted by the wind as clouds, descend at length in showers of rain and snow, and finally, in the form of rivers, flow onward to join again the ocean from which they at first proceeded. The investigations of Lieutenant Maury have enabled him to connect meteorological effects in one region with causes in another, and often a far distant one. Thus, it appears to be well estab-

lished that by far the greater part of the moisture which descends on our mountains and fertilizes our valleys, which forms the Mississippi, the St. Lawrence with its lakes, and all the other streams of North America,—that all this moisture is derived from the grand and distant reservoir of the South Pacific Ocean. Dry up that reservoir of the Southwestern Sea, and the Mississippi would lose its majesty, the great lakes recede from their borders, and our whole land mourn for the want of those showers by which it is now continually refreshed. Thus does the seeming superabundance of waters but minister to the land the means it needs to fit it for the residence of animals and man; and thus, even where there is the appearance of most lavish expenditure, is the Divine economy most gloriously vindicated.

A confirmation of the views presented in the third chapter is given in the fourth, entitled “Red Fogs and Sea Dust.” It appears from this that, under the microscope of Professor Ehrenberg, the Infusoria scattered by the winds on the southern regions of Europe, from Malta to the Tyrol, exhibit South American forms; and our author concludes that these Infusoria came from the plains of the Lower Orinoco, by a similar path to that by which the water evaporated from the South Pacific Ocean is brought to irrigate the continent of North America.

In the fifth chapter, the discovery, by Faraday, of the magnetic property of oxygen, is made the basis of ingenious speculations upon the manner in which that mysterious and powerful agency of magnetism affects the circulation of the winds.

The subject next treated of is “The Currents of the Sea.” Among the interesting facts here brought forward are the existence of a constant under-current westward through the Straits of Gibraltar, opposite to the upper current, which is well known to be ever pouring inward from the Atlantic;—the existence of similar currents at the entrance of the Red Sea, and in the Polar regions;—the “Gulf Stream” of the Pacific, along the coast of China;—the non-existence, on the other hand, of an old terror to mariners, in the form of a permanent and powerful current westward from Cape St. Roque, on the coast of Brazil.

The seventh chapter treats of "The Open Sea in the Arctic Ocean," the existence of which is confirmed by the evidence adduced to prove the opposing north and south currents of the Polar regions.

In chapter eighth, the great mystery of "The Salts of the Sea" is explored, and with most interesting results. We observe how, while some agencies of nature are employed in increasing the quantity of salt in the ocean, other agencies — among them that of the coral insects, in their minute but magnificent work — are engaged in removing the superabundance; while the currents already described prevent any injurious inequality in the diffusion of salt through the ocean. In this chapter occurs the following striking description, extracted from the narrative of an Arctic voyage, by Captain Duncan, of the English whale-ship Dundee. It is given to illustrate the power of the currents in the Polar regions, which bear along the icebergs.

"The dreadful apprehensions that assailed us yesterday, by the near approach of the iceberg, were this day most awfully verified. About three P. M., the iceberg came in contact with our floe, and in less than one minute it broke the ice; we were frozen in quite close to the shore; the floe was shattered to pieces for several miles, causing an explosion like an earthquake, or one hundred pieces of heavy ordnance fired at the same moment. The iceberg, with awful but majestic grandeur, (in height and dimensions resembling a vast mountain,) came almost up to our stern, and every one expected it would have run over the ship." — p. 163.

The ninth chapter describes to us the Equatorial Ring of Clouds, whose friendly shade Divine Wisdom has interposed between the sun and the regions most subjected to its heat.

"The Geological Agency of the Winds," is the subject next discussed. We cannot, in this brief view, give more than a reference to the beautiful and convincing course of reasoning by which the phenomena of the present depressed basins of the Dead and Caspian Seas are connected with grand geological changes in the distant continent of South America; and by which the existence of that continent is shown to be the cause of the want of irrigation in Africa. The old rustic who maintained that Tenterden steeple was the cause of

Goodwin Sands, might have taken courage to bear the laugh of those around him, if he could have foreseen that Science herself would point out a connection between the Andes and the Desert of Sahara.

But a more serious thought is well suggested to us by the philosopher who unfolds these wonders.

"Here then," says Lieutenant Maury, "we see harmony in the winds, design in the mountains, order in the sea, arrangement in the dust, and form for the desert. Here are signs of beauty and works of grandeur; and we may now fancy, that, in this exquisite system of adaptations and compensations, we can almost behold, in the Red and Mediterranean Seas, the very waters that were held in the hollow of the Almighty hand when he weighed the Andes and balanced the hills of Africa in his comprehensive scales." — pp. 197, 198.

Chapter XI. discusses "The Depths of the Ocean," describes the difficulties that have been encountered in ascertaining them, and the most successful instrument for this purpose, invented by Mr. Brooke, of the United States navy.

In the next chapter, on "The Basin of the Atlantic," an account is given of interesting results already obtained by means of this instrument. Specimens of the soil, from the depth of more than two miles, were examined with the microscope by Professor Bailey of West Point. He testifies that "they are chiefly made up of perfect little calcareous shells," thus furnishing a new demonstration of that wonderful economy in nature which fills creation with life.

"The Winds" form the subject of the thirteenth chapter, which is followed by others on "The Climates of the Ocean," "The Drift of the Sea," on "Storms," and "Routes"; after which "A Last Word" invites the co-operation of all navigators in the observations which are producing such valuable results. In the chapter on "Routes," an animated account is given of the voyages made by four American vessels, at the same time, from New York to California. This race, of fifteen thousand miles in length, and three months in duration, is brought forward to illustrate how well the paths of the ocean are now understood. The navigators, "like travellers on the land, pass and repass, fall in with and recognize each other by the way." (p. 209.)

We take our leave of this most interesting volume, thankful for the evidence it affords of the scientific attainments of the officers, both in our navy and commercial marine; and still more, that in their noble daring, and ingenious research, they recognize with a devout spirit the proofs spread all around them of the wisdom and goodness of the Creator. In illustration, alike of this spirit and of the influence of Lieutenant Maury's researches, we quote a few lines from a letter, published in his appendix, from William L. Phinney, captain of the ship "Gertrude."

"For myself, I am free to confess that for many years I commanded a ship, and although never insensible to the beauties of nature upon the sea or land, I yet feel that, until I took up your work, I had been traversing the ocean blindfolded. I did not think, I did not know, the amazing and beautiful combination of all the works of Him whom you so beautifully term 'the Great First Thought.'

"I feel that, aside from any pecuniary profit to myself from your labors, you have done me good as a man. You have taught me to look above, around, and beneath me, and recognize God's hand in every element by which I am surrounded. I am grateful for this personal benefit. Your remarks on this subject, so frequently made in your work, cause in me feelings of the greatest admiration, although my capacity to comprehend your beautiful theory is very limited." — p. 287.

S. G. B.

ART. III. — UNITARIANISM AND ORTHODOXY ON THE ATONEMENT.

PURSuing our general review of a half-century of the controversy still in agitation between the divided representatives of the old Congregational body of New England, we have summed up the views of the two parties on two of their great doctrinal issues. It remains for us to follow the same method in dealing with what we have already defined as the third of the chief topics of discussion and division. This concerns the Scripture doctrine of the Atonement: the agency of Jesus Christ in securing the reconciliation between God and men;

the need of such an agency, the mode of its operation and of its efficacy.

"Unitarians deny the doctrine of the Atonement," is the judgment pronounced against us by the Orthodox. "Unitarians believe the doctrine of the Atonement," is our earnest, self-convinced, and solemn assertion, made in answer to that judgment. What then? Is it a question of veracity between us, involving a slander or falsehood on the one side, and a plea of self-defence on the other? No! There may be misunderstanding, there may be misrepresentation, but we make no charge of intentional falsifying. Is it then a question as to the meaning of a word, so that, while the parties respectively affirm or deny, they do not affirm and deny the same thing, because they attach quite different significations to the same word on which the whole issue hangs? There certainly is involved in the controversy much difference of opinion and much debate as to the meaning of a few very important words, especially of the word *atonement*. The controversy some years ago turned far more than it does now upon the meaning of that one word. Unitarians insisted, that the word *atonement*, according to its etymology and its actual use at the time when our English version of the Bible adopted it, signified *reconciliation*. Unitarians also urged, that a false view of the Scripture doctrine had connected an erroneous association with the word *atonement*, had in fact changed its popular signification; and that the word *reconciliation* ought to be substituted for it in the only place where it occurs in the New Testament. Orthodox controversialists stoutly and obstinately denied these assertions. Happily, however, that point may now be regarded as yielded by them. So far, the controversy as a strife about words has abated. But while the embarrassment of one merely verbal dispute is set aside, the controversy is still largely and almost hopelessly complicated with questions as to the signification and the interpretation of terms of language. Charity, therefore, requires of us to explain that, when the Orthodox so flatly and positively affirm that Unitarians *do not* believe the doctrine of the Atonement, in spite of the assertion of the Unitarians that they do believe it, the Orthodox mean simply that Unitarians do not accept *their*

interpretation of the Scripture doctrine. The Orthodox, taking for granted the infallibility of their decision in scholarship, criticism, and matters of open debate in the articles of Christian faith, identify their conclusions with Scripture doctrine. They hold Unitarians not only to a belief of the Scripture doctrine of Atonement, but also to a reception of their construction and interpretation of that doctrine. It is thus that an issue is opened between the two parties, and fairly opened. The controversy has so far warranted its own just grounds and occasion, as to prove that the assurance heretofore exhibited, in quietly taking for granted the identity of Orthodoxy and of Scripture doctrine, had better give way to the more becoming and deliberate processes of patient, serious, and humble examination. Disciples of Christ, as sincere and faithful as any of those whose names shine on the records of the Church Universal: scholars as profoundly versed in the mysteries of tongues and interpretation as any of those whom Orthodoxy has accepted for oracles: and humble, obedient, and hopeful disciples of the faith in every condition of human life, have found a glorious and merciful doctrine of Atonement in the Scriptures, quite different from that which Orthodoxy teaches. The issue, then, is not whether the Orthodox speak truth or untruth when they affirm that Unitarians do not believe the atonement; but the issue is simply and solely this,—What is the Scripture doctrine of the atoning work of Christ? If the Orthodox have any advantage over the Unitarians, as respects sincerity of purpose, or docility of mind, or humility of spirit, they have but to claim it, and to prove their claim. They will find us quite easy of conviction on proper proof. Failing any such inequality of position or advantage, the issue between the parties seems to be, as in fact it always has been, one depending entirely upon an honest and intelligent interpretation of the Scriptures. The candid Bishop Butler has frankly remarked, “There is not, I think, anything relating to Christianity which has been more objected against, than the mediation of Christ in some or other of its parts.”* The admission affords an admirable introduction to every attempt at a fair

* Analogy, Part II. Chap. V.

inquiry, for the sake of discovering where the strength of the objection to the Orthodox doctrine really lies.

Would that the time had fully come for the treatment of this theme solely under a positive form of statement, simply to present accepted truth in all its manifold relations of tenderness and power for the heart of man ; because the Christian doctrine of Atonement is a doctrine which, by the consent of all parties, addresses the heart. There are two emphatic reasons which make it above all things desirable that this doctrine, instead of being a ground of division and alienation between Christian believers, should be the very point of their warmest sympathy and union. For, first, the doctrine which opens the way for our reconciliation to God, ought to reconcile us to each other, to engage our common love, to harmonize all our alienations, and to be the bond of peace between believers. And second, as this is one of the fundamental doctrines of Christian theology, it must constitute one of the chief tests of the truth and value of that great remedial scheme of the Gospel. The doctrine truly stated must furnish the strongest testimony for the truth and the adequacy of the alleged Divine intervention for the deliverance of men ; while any false view or perversion of the doctrine will at once constitute the most offensive obstacle in the way of a confiding belief, and will make the Gospel most impotent where it ought to be most effective in its power. Indeed, our consciousness of moral and spiritual disease, our sense of exposure under sin and of our need of redemption, the measure of our love and gratitude to Christ as the medium of relief, and our views of the character, attributes, and government of God, will all be affected by our view of the nature and method of that remedy which the Gospel has provided.

We think we express the prevailing sentiment among Unitarians when we say that this is the theme upon which they love the least to dispute, are the most reluctant to engage in controversy, and are the most anxious to have a clear understanding with their opponents as to the grounds of division and the prospects of harmonizing our differences. We feel that the subject is alien from all strife, a subject eminently engaging, pacifying, and constraining of sympathy and harmony. That

Christ died for us in any sense, ought to exclude his death from angry or passionate controversy among those who claim to share the benefits of his sacrifice. It is a grievous thing to us to be told that we deny his Atonement, and then to have so severe a charge vindicated by forcing upon the Scriptures a doctrine which we are persuaded is not taught there, but is an inference or invention of the mind of man. And especially is it grievous to us to be charged, as even now we are charged, — when we affirm that we believe the doctrine, — with using words deceptively, and with trying to claim Orthodox sympathy of belief under double meanings of language and the perversion of terms from their ordinary significations. It is only from the sense and the smart of the wrong thus inflicted upon us, that we still engage in controversy upon this doctrine. We say that we do find a doctrine of Atonement in the Scriptures, and that we heartily and gratefully believe it: that the doctrine exalts Christ as the Saviour, wins to him our highest trust and love, and brings us adoringly to praise that once alienated Father in heaven, whose love has provided a means for the redemption and salvation of men. Our opponents, venturing at once to assume their own infallibility in the dogmatic view which they have formed of the method and efficacy of the Atonement, and to pronounce upon the inadequacy of the faith which we hold and love, charge us with a denial of the Scripture doctrine of Atonement. Hence arises the issue between us. We are perfectly ready to meet it.

On no other of the larger or the lesser topics that have entered into this controversy has there been so wide a variation, and so marked a modification in the specific terms of the Orthodox doctrine, as on this of the Atonement. Without claiming that Orthodoxy has made any distinct approximation to our views, or has essentially relieved what is and has always been to Unitarians the most unscriptural and offensive quality of its doctrine of the Atonement, we may safely affirm that it has essentially changed its own dogmatic position. The definition of the Atonement made by the leading Orthodox divines of the present day is quite different from that given two centuries ago by those whom they claim to represent. Notwithstanding the very bold assertions

made in the religious newspapers issued from week to week this current year, that Orthodoxy has not departed from its standards, and that it still holds to "the substance" of the Calvinistic formulas, it is impossible for us to assent to the assertions, when we compare pages of the old divinity on our shelves with the recent productions of some of the most eminent men of the Orthodox communions. Would Cotton, Hooker, Shepherd, Edwards, or Hopkins have admitted, with Dr. E. Beecher, that the system of Orthodoxy is utterly inconsistent with the principles of honor and justice in the Divine government? Or with Professor Park, that the rhetoric of Orthodoxy needs to be toned down, if one would harmonize it with logical truth? Or with Dr. Bushnell, that the death of Christ is a dramatic scene, in which we must discriminate between the subjective and the objective meaning? Ask the aged persons among us who used to listen to Orthodox preaching, if its tone, and even its substance, are not changed.

Therefore, the issue between us now is not exactly what it was even fifty years ago. Those terrific and harrowing representations of some of the Divine attributes which were current in the old divinity, do not enter into modern preaching. Those dramatic representations of the covenant work between God and Christ, involving stipulations as to what the Father should require to soothe his wrath and accept as the ransom of human souls, and as to how much the Son should suffer, are now withdrawn, either in deference to the exactions of good taste, or as a consequence of an actual change of opinion. Some of the many sharp points of the Orthodox doctrine are worn smooth. Vague terms which may be unobjectionable are substituted for very shocking terms once in common use. It is getting to be difficult now to discuss the real issue between the parties, without a vast deal of definition and interpretation, and clearing up of the outworks of language and ideas. We take in our hands some of the modern essays on the doctrine of the Atonement, and as we begin the perusal it would seem as if some of the views most antagonistic to our own convictions were about to receive a most offensive statement, leading farther and farther as the argument progressed to a perfectly heathen

conclusion. But no! They melt and soften and become very yielding, till, what with dramatic uses of language and shapings of thought and governmental theories, the sternness of the reader's brow is relaxed, his dissent is soothed, a degree of sympathy, a stage of conviction, is wrought within him, and he asks, Is the old doctrine reduced down to this?

But what is the doctrine? and where does the controversy upon it between Unitarianism and Orthodoxy commence? and in what directions do the parties diverge? and what is the substance of their difference? We shall soon have to ask here, as we have asked concerning the two previous topics which we have discussed, What was the doctrine when the controversy opened, and before it had been reduced to simpler and more vague and elusive terms as the result of controversy?

The English word, the noun *atonement*, occurs but once in our version of the New Testament (Romans v. 11). No respectable scholar or writer would now affirm or argue, — as was once affirmed and argued, — that the original word in the Greek should here be rendered by an English word conveying the sense of compensation, commutation, or expiation.* The verb to which the noun is related means, and is translated, *to reconcile*, and atonement, or at-onement, is reconciliation, as in other instances it is rendered. An explicit avowal to this effect has recently been made by Professor Pond of the Bangor Theological Seminary:† “An atonement, therefore, in the sense of our translators, is a reconciliation. But the word has undergone a slight change of meaning within the last two hundred years. As now used, it denotes not so much a reconciliation, as that which is done *to open and prepare the way for* a reconciliation. As used by Evangelical Christians, it refers to what has been done by our Lord Jesus Christ, *to open a way* for the recovery and salvation of sinful men, that so a reconciliation may be effected between them and their Maker.” It is something to have the fact clearly and fully admitted that the Apostle's word does not imply

* Dr. Woods says: “The word *atonement* has become ambiguous, its common use being somewhat different from its use in Scripture.” (Works, Vol. II. p. 493.)

† See his Article in *Bibliotheca Sacra* for January, 1856, p. 130.

the sense which has long been associated in controversy with the word *atonement*, a sense which Dr. Webster has very unwarrantably introduced into his English Dictionary. Our literature in the age of Shakespeare will show the signification of the word then to have been *reconciliation*. The perversion of the Scripture doctrine gave to the word *atonement* the new use which it begins to have in the literature of the age of Queen Ann.* We might, indeed, raise a question as to the perfect accuracy of the signification which Dr. Pond says that Orthodoxy now assigns to the word. We certainly should wish to include under "what has been *done* by Jesus Christ," what was *said* by him, with the same design of opening a way for reconciliation.

The doctrine of Atonement or reconciliation is one of a large sweep and compass, and the first condition for any fair and satisfactory treatment of it is to secure the discussion of it, at the very start, against all such influence from definitions or limitations, as will surely give us a part instead of the whole doctrine. The question is, not what theory about it will the thought or the reason of man adopt or approve, but what do the Scriptures teach us concerning the doctrine, as it is exclusively a doctrine of revelation? The sweep of the doctrine embraces a great many contingencies dependent upon a duplication or an alternative connected with all of the large elements which enter into it. Thus Christ may be regarded either as a medium for announcing terms of reconciliation from God, or as an agent for facilitating and accomplishing such a reconciliation; or he may be both the announcer and the agent of the process of reconciliation. The Orthodox doctrine assumes that sin is an infinite wrong, and deserves an infinite punishment or

* "*Lod.* Is there division 'twixt thy lord and Cassio?

"*Des.* A most unhappy one; I would do much
T' atone them, for the love I bear to Cassio."

Shaksp. *Othello*, Act. IV. Sc. 1.

"Or each atone his guilty love with life." — Pope.

The transition between the two meanings is well marked in Milton:

"Man,

. once dead in sins and lost,
Atonement for himself or offering meet,
Indebted and undone, hath none to bring."

Par. Lost, Book III. l. 234.

requires an infinite expiation, because it is committed against an Infinite Being. This is looking at facts from one point of view, namely, the Divine. But the alternative point of view would suggest the question, How can sin be of such infinite demerit, seeing that it is committed by a finite and limited being? Another duplication of issues presents itself in the rivalry of claims on our fullest affections raised by the confusion in the Orthodox theology which refers the prime movement for our redemption to the *love of God*, or to the *interposition of Christ*. This confusion is not removed by the interchange of such references, or by the attempt to prove them identical. When Calvinism tells us that the Father *chose* and *appointed* and *qualified* the Son to be our Redeemer, and also that the Son *offered* himself to be our sacrifice, one who would have clear thoughts, so far as he has any, must ask, Which of these two statements would Orthodoxy have us accept? Again, Was Christ's death an actual expiation, equivalent in anguish to all the sufferings that sinners would have endured, or was it a demonstrative exhibition of a legal penalty? Once more, Did or did not the Divine nature of Christ share in his sufferings? Still other alternatives of doctrine present themselves in the divergencies of Orthodox teaching as to the relations between the Divine Justice and the Divine Mercy, by which God might or might not freely forgive, while his law might or might not freely remit; and in the discordant opinions as to whether a knowledge of the sacrifice to be made, and now made by Christ, was and is necessary or not necessary to all who share in its benefits. And finally, Is the Atonement limited or unlimited in its efficacy? These are all complications of the controversy for us, and the grounds of minor controversies among the Orthodox themselves.

There is no chapter in the old Confession of Faith of the New England churches, which is still the standard for the Orthodox Congregationalists, devoted specifically to the doctrine of the Atonement. The word itself does not occur in that formula, nor even in the Westminster Catechism. The substantial Orthodox doctrine under which our fathers were educated, and which was had in view at the opening of the Unitarian controversy, is found in Chapter VIII. of the Confession, under the title "Of Christ the Mediator," as follows:—

“ It pleased God in his eternal purpose to choose and ordain the Lord Jesus, his only begotten Son, according to a covenant made between them both, to be the mediator between God and man: the prophet, priest, and king, the head and Saviour of his Church, the heir of all things, and judge of the world: unto whom he did from all eternity give a people to be his seed, and to be by him in time redeemed, called, justified, sanctified, and glorified. The Son of God, the second person in the Trinity, being very and eternal God of one substance, and equal with the Father, did, when the fulness of time was come, take upon him man’s nature, with all the essential properties and common infirmities thereof, yet without sin, being conceived by the power of the Holy Ghost in the womb of the Virgin Mary, of her substance, — which person is very God and very man, yet one Christ, the only mediator between God and man; — was sanctified and anointed with the Holy Spirit above measure, — that he might be thoroughly furnished to execute the office of a mediator and surety: which office he took not unto himself, but was thereunto called by his Father, — and did most willingly undertake; which that he might discharge, he was made under the law, and did perfectly fulfil it, and underwent the punishment due to us, which we should have borne and suffered, being made sin and a curse for us, enduring most grievous torments immediately from God in his soul, and most painful sufferings in his body, was crucified and died, was buried and remained under the power of death: — by his perfect obedience and sacrifice of himself, which he through the Eternal Spirit once offered up unto God, he hath fully satisfied the justice of God, and purchased not only reconciliation, but an everlasting inheritance in the kingdom of heaven for all those whom the Father hath given unto him. Although the work of redemption was not actually wrought by Christ till after his incarnation, yet the virtue, efficacy, and benefits thereof were communicated to the elect in all ages successively from the beginning of the world,” &c.

We must bear as well as we can the confusion of terms and the irreconcilable statements in this formula; they are some of the dreary conditions to which any one must submit in reading even, and still more in attempting to digest, the schemes of divinity wrought out from the fan-

cies of theologians. Here we are told of a covenant between two persons, when in fact there was but *One*; of a Mediator between two parties, who was himself one of those parties; of an office "willingly undertaken" by the Son, which, however, "he did not take upon himself," because "he was called to it by the Father"; of a being who was essentially the Supreme God, who yet "was sanctified and anointed with the Holy Spirit"; of a being compounded of Deity and humanity, in order that the union of Deity might exalt a sacrifice in which, however, only the human nature suffered; of Christ's thus "purchasing from God" those whom God "had given" to him from all eternity; and finally, we read that the death of Christ is made to stand as a substitute or equivalent for the eternal torments and the remorseful heart-sufferings of millions of condemned sinners. If we pass by these confused and inconsistent terms in the old formula of the doctrine of Redemption, our attention is fixed, and our protest is raised, by the following sentences in the Confession: "Christ underwent the punishment due to us"; "enduring most grievous torments immediately from God in his soul," "he hath fully satisfied the justice of God," and "he hath purchased reconciliation." The statements and inferences of doctrine in these sentences formerly constituted the staple matter of Calvinistic teaching concerning the redeeming work of Christ: they present to us the essential, the peculiar, the characteristic features of Calvinism. One who honestly assumes the name of a Calvinist will unflinchingly accept these essential elements of his creed, and will make no adroit attempts to evade them. Any one who takes the name of a Calvinist, and yet endeavors to soften or explain away the manifest meaning of these sentences will certainly act more candidly if he will change his own name, which he is at liberty to do, and give over trifling with written formulas, which he is not at liberty to do. Of late the sharper phraseology, the positive and unqualified statements which we find in the above sentences, have yielded to a less direct implication of more or less of their substance, and to an infinite variety of softening constructions put upon them.

If, in the course of this controversy, some nominal Calvinists had not ventured to deny the truthfulness of the representations made by Unitarians as to the essen-

tial views expressed by Calvin himself, one would hardly suppose that any question could be raised on this point. The following sentences, all drawn from the sixteenth chapter of the second book of Calvin's Institutes, are a fair exhibition of his theology on this point: "That Christ has taken upon himself and suffered the punishment which by the righteous judgment of God impended over all sinners; that by his blood he has expiated those crimes which render them odious to God; that by this expiation God the Father has been satisfied and duly atoned; that by this intercessor his wrath has been appeased; that this is the foundation of peace between God and men; that this is the bond of his benevolence towards them." "Indeed, we must admit that it was impossible for God to be truly appeased in any other way, than by Christ renouncing all concern for himself, and submitting and devoting himself entirely to his will." "For we ought particularly to remember this satisfaction, that we may not spend our whole lives in terror and anxiety, as though we were pursued by the righteous vengeance of God, which the Son of God has transferred to himself." "For the Son of God, though perfectly free from all sin, nevertheless assumed the disgrace and ignominy of our iniquities, and, on the other hand, arrayed us in his purity." "Christ at his death was offered to the Father as an expiatory sacrifice, in order that, a complete atonement being made by his oblation, we may no longer dread the Divine wrath." "If Christ had merely died a corporeal death, no end would have been accomplished by it; it was requisite, also, that he should feel the severity of the Divine vengeance, in order to appease the wrath of God and satisfy his justice. Hence it was necessary for him to contend with the powers of hell and the horror of eternal death." "Christ suffered in his soul the dreadful torments of a person condemned and irretrievably lost." "And, indeed, if his soul had experienced no punishment, he would have been only a Redeemer for the body." "Whence we may conclude what dreadful and horrible agonies he must have suffered, while he was conscious of standing at the tribunal of God accused as a criminal on our account." *

* That we might not intensify by our own version any of the expressions

The Assembly's Catechism tells us that "Christ was a sacrifice to Divine Justice." The old divines, who made the Catechism the expository rule of their faith, were wont to receive its statements literally. They held themselves bound to an unflinching fidelity to its doctrines. We will take, as an illustration of this remark, the example of that pious Puritan minister, John Flavel, son of Rev. Richard Flavel, who entered upon his work in Dartmouth, Old England, just two centuries ago, and whose devotional spirit and writings have made him a favorite among the disciples of Orthodoxy to this day.* He published an Exposition of the Assembly's Catechism, and had no distinction among his brethren as one who forced it beyond a fair construction of its doctrinal statements. It will be seen by a few extracts from his sermons, how boldly and literally he was disposed to accept all that was implied in the Calvinistic view of the Covenant of Redemption. Our extracts are made from the folio edition of his works, Edinburgh, 1731. It should be observed that he aims to support all his positions by references to texts in Scripture, made after the usage of his time, without the slightest recognition of any just principles of biblical criticism, and with an entire disregard of the connection in which the passages quoted stand in the original.

Flavel's third sermon is on "Christ's Compact with the Father for the Recovery of the Elect." Isaiah liii. 12.

"Doctrine, that the business of man's salvation was transacted upon covenant terms betwixt the Father and the Son from all eternity." "The substance of this Covenant of Redemption is dialogue-wise exprest to us in Isaiah xlix. Having told God how ready and fit he was for his service, he will know of Him what reward he shall have for his work, for he resolves his blood shall not be sold at low and cheap rates. Hereupon the Father offers him the elect of Israel for his reward, bidding low at first, (as they that make bargains use to do,) and only offers him that small remnant still intending to bid higher. But Christ will not be satisfied with these; he values his Blood higher than so. Therefore he is

used by Calvin, we have adopted the translation of the Institutes published by the Presbyterian Board at Philadelphia.

* The late Dr. Alexander, the Princeton Professor, wrote, "To John Flavel I certainly owe more than to any uninspired author." — *Life*, by his Son, p. 47.

brought in complaining, '*I have labored in vain, and spent my strength for naught.*' This is but a small reward for so great sufferings as I must undergo; my blood is much more worth than this comes to, and will be sufficient to redeem all the elect dispersed among the isles of the Gentiles, as well as the lost sheep of the house of Israel. Hereupon the Father comes up higher, and tells him He intends to reward him better than so." "The persons transacting and dealing with each other in this covenant are great persons, God the Father, and God the Son: the former as a creditor, and the latter as a surety. The Father stands upon satisfaction, the Son engages to give it." "And forasmuch as the Father knew it was a hard and difficult work His Son was to undertake, a work that would have broken the backs of all the angels in heaven and men on earth, had they engaged in it, therefore He promiseth to stand by him, and assist and strengthen him for it." We read that the Father also agreed to furnish Christ with all the necessary qualifications for his work, and to reward him for accomplishing it. "The Father so far trusted Christ, that upon the credit of his promise to come into the world, and in the fulness of time to become a sacrifice for the elect, He saved all the Old Testament saints, whose faith also respected a Christ to come." (pp. 6, 7.)

In the next sermon, on John iii. 16, we read:—

"God's giving of Christ implies his delivering him into the hands of justice to be punished: even as condemned persons are by sentence of law given or delivered into the hands of executioners. The Lord, when the time was come that Christ must suffer, did as it were say, 'O all ye roaring waves of my incensed justice, now swell as high as heaven, and go over his soul and body: sink him to the bottom; let him go, like Jonah, his type, into the belly of hell, unto the roots of the mountains. Come, all ye raging storms that I have reserved for this day of wrath, beat upon him, beat him down. Go, justice, put him upon the rack, torment him in every part,' &c. (p. 9.) This terrible vengeance is represented as but fulfilling what the Father in the compact had announced to the Son, thus: "My Son, if thou undertake for them, thou must reckon to pay the last mite; expect no abatements; if I spare them, I will not spare thee." (p. 8.) "To wrath, to the wrath of

an infinite God, without mixture, to the very torments of hell, was Christ delivered, and that by the hand of his own Father." (p. 10.)

With equal plainness does this earnest and outspoken Calvinist insist, in his eighth sermon, that God could not exercise his mercy without satisfaction to his justice. "He, therefore, that will be a Mediator of Reconciliation betwixt God and man, must bring God a price in his hand, and that adequate to the offence and wrong done Him, else He will not treat about peace." (p. 21.) "Our Mediator, like Jonah his type, seeing the stormy sea of God's wrath working tempestuously, and ready to swallow us up, cast in himself to appease the storm." (p. 22.) More distinctly still we read in the twelfth sermon: "The design and end of this oblation was to atone, pacify, and reconcile God, by giving him a full and adequate compensation or satisfaction for the sins of these his elect. From this oblation Christ made of himself to God for our sins, we infer the inflexible severity of Divine justice, which could be no other way diverted from us and appeased, but by the blood of Christ. And though he brake out upon the cross in that heart-rending complaint, 'My God! my God! why hast thou forsaken me?' yet no abatement: justice will not bend in the least, but, having to do with him on this account, resolves to fetch its pennyworths out of his blood." (p. 35.) In the fourteenth sermon Flavel says: "Only the blood of God is found an equivalent price for the redemption of souls." (p. 41.)

Conformed to these representations is Flavel's description of the actual sufferings endured by Christ, thus: "The wrath of an infinite, dreadful God beat him down to the dust. His body full of pain and exquisite tortures in every part. Not a member or sense but was the seat and subject of torment." (p. 88.) "His cry was like the perpetual shriek of them that are cast away for ever. Yea, in sufferings at this time in his soul, equivalent to all that which our souls should have suffered there to all eternity." (p. 102.) "As it was all the wrath of God that lay upon Christ, so it was wrath aggravated in divers respects, beyond that which the damned themselves do suffer." (p. 106.)

One other quotation will prove that the author did not believe that God would grant to Christ anything

beyond the covenant as it embraced the *elect*. The extract is in strange contrast with admissions made by eminent champions of Orthodoxy at the present day, in allowing an unlimited atonement and the efficacy of Christ's death for millions who have or have had no knowledge of him. It is from Sermon XV.: "Hence we infer the impossibility of their salvation that know not Christ, nor have interest in his blood. Neither heathens, nor merely nominal Christians, can inherit heaven. I know some are very indulgent to the heathen, and many formal Christians are but too much so to themselves. But union by faith with Jesus Christ is the only way revealed in Scripture by which we hope to come to the heavenly inheritance. I know it seems hard that such brave men as some of the heathens were should be damned. But the Scripture knows no other way to glory but Christ put on and applied by faith. And it is the common suffrage of modern sound divines, that no man, by the sole conduct of Nature, without the knowledge of Christ, can be saved." (p. 44.)

Thus the old Calvinistic construction of the doctrine was, that the obedience of Christ takes the place of our lack of obedience; that he became to God the personal substitute for condemned sinners; that by the imputation of our transgressions to him, he endured the suffering threatened upon us; and that, by bearing the just penalty of an outraged law, he discharged our indebtedness to it, and purchased our redemption from the Lawgiver. It would be possible, if time and space allowed, to trace by a chain of quotations from Orthodox divines the course of softening and modifying speculations which have reduced the old doctrine to the mildest form of the governmental theory, presenting the elder Edwards and Dr. Hopkins as the mediums for working the prominent changes in the use of terms or in the construction put upon them. We might thus easily exhibit, were it worth our while, all the shadings off, if we should not rather say the shadings over, of the old doctrine. Edwards very ingeniously remarks: "Most of the words which are used in this affair have various significations."* The following sentences from this eminent divine will exhibit his views of "the Work of Redemp-

* Works, edition of 1808, Vol. II. p. 190.

tion": "There is no mercy exercised towards man but what is obtained through Christ's intercession." (p. 26.) "For when man [Adam] had sinned, God the Father would have no more to do with man immediately; he would no more have any immediate concern with this world of mankind that had apostatized from, and rebelled against him." (p. 27.) "All is done by the price that Christ lays down. But the price that Christ lays down does two things. It pays our debt, and so it *satisfies*. By its intrinsic value, and by the agreement between the Father and the Son, it procures a title to us for happiness, and so it *merits*. The satisfaction of Christ is to free us from misery, and the merit of Christ is to purchase happiness for us." (p. 190.) "The satisfaction of Christ consists in his answering the demands of the law on man, which were consequent on the breach of the law. These were answered by suffering the penalty of the law. The merit of Christ consists in what he did to answer the demands of the law, which were prior to man's breach of the law, or to fulfil what the law demanded before man sinned, which was obedience." (p. 191.)

There is a savor of good old Mr. Flavel's view of the "covenant work" in the following account given of it by the excellent Dr. Hopkins: "It is evident from Scripture, as well as from the nature of the case, that there was a mutual agreement and engagement between the Father and the second person of the Trinity, respecting the redemption of man, by which the distinct part which each person in the Trinity was to act was fixed and undertaken. This mutual agreement is of the nature of a covenant and engagement with each other to perform the different parts of this great work which were assigned to them. This is an eternal covenant without beginning, as is the existence of the triune God, and as are all the divine purposes and decrees. The second person was engaged to become incarnate,—to do and suffer all that was necessary for the salvation of men. The Father promised that, on his consenting to take upon him the character and work of a Mediator and Redeemer, he should be every way furnished and assisted to go through with the work; that he should have power to save an elect number of mankind, and form a church and kingdom most perfect and glorious. In

order to accomplish this, all things—all power in heaven and earth—should be given to him, until redemption was completed. And then he should reign in the exercise of all his offices as Mediator, in his Church and kingdom for ever.” After quoting passages of Scripture by the old method to authenticate these views, Dr. Hopkins adds: “Though in the passages of Scripture which have been mentioned, and others of the same kind, the third person in the Trinity, the Holy Spirit, is not expressly mentioned as covenanting or engaging to perform any part of this work, yet he is necessarily understood as concerned and included in this covenant, as he is in the Holy Scripture everywhere represented as acting an equal part in the redemption of man, and therefore must be considered as taking that particular part by consent and agreement.”* Were it not for the more dramatic view of the “covenant,” not between God and man, but between the Father and the Son, which we have already quoted from Flavel, and which might be paralleled from other divines, we might affirm that Dr. Hopkins was not wholly destitute of the imaginative faculty in having conjured up the above conceit, for which the Bible is not responsible. His ingenuity in apologizing for the apparent neglect of the Holy Spirit is not the least striking element in his description. He is explicit in stating a limited atonement, limited at least in its actual work. “Redemption,” he says, “does not extend to all sinful, fallen creatures, but many are left to suffer the just consequence of their rebellion in everlasting punishment. It is expressly and repeatedly declared in divine revelation, that a part of mankind shall be punished for ever.” (p. 248.) Anticipatory hints of the “governmental theory,” as now held by a philosophical school of Orthodox divines, are to be found scattered over Dr. Hopkins’s pages. He speaks of what is consistent or inconsistent with “rectoral righteousness.” He says: “The sufferings of Christ answer the same end with respect to law and divine government, that otherwise must be answered by the eternal destruction of the sinner.” (p. 328.) He says the blood shed upon the cross “was the blood of God.” (p. 282.) Dr. Hopkins is generally very scrupulous and

* Professor Park’s edition of Hopkins’s Works, Vol. I. pp. 356–358.

careful to sustain his own strongest assertions by references to passages of Scripture, which, however strangely or fancifully he may quote them, and however unjustifiable and inapplicable the use he makes of them, prove at least his fair intent to bring his assertions to a true test. But for one of his boldest assertions, that which covers one of the vital and most disputable points in the whole discussion of the atonement, he alleges no Scripture authority. Thus he says: "*It was in early times expressly declared* that sacrifices and offerings were not desirable, or of any worth, in themselves considered, and that God did not institute and require them for their own sake, as making any real atonement for sin; *but that this should be made by an incarnate Redeemer*, to whom they pointed as types and shadows of him." (p. 325.) The good doctor drew wholly on his imagination here, as regards the statement which we have put in italics. It was in early times expressly declared and emphatically reiterated, that sacrifices had no value except as they indicated penitence and piety of heart. Obedience was better. The Jewish sacrifices were subordinated to contrition, mercy, faith, and amendment of life,—*never in a single instance to another prospective sacrifice*. Scripture has not a word to this effect.

The favorite form under which the old doctrine is now advocated by the advanced party among those who claim to represent the ancient Orthodoxy of Congregationalism, is called technically "the Governmental Theory." We will cite a quite recent and very clear statement of it. Dr. Pond, in the article above referred to in the "Bibliotheca Sacra," states, as the first reason for the necessity of Christ's agency in reconciliation, that which all Christians will heartily accept, namely, that it "was necessary in order that sinners might *be humbled and brought to repentance*." He might have quoted many beautiful Scripture sentences in proof of this statement, as every doctrine that is really Scriptural may be expressed more beautifully and forcibly in that than in any other language. Thus: "It behooved Christ to suffer and to rise from the dead, that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations." (Luke xxiv. 46, 47.) "God, having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities." (Acts iii. 26.)

But, adds Dr. Pond, "This necessity for the atonement is not, after all, the most urgent and fundamental. There is a necessity greater than this. We remark, therefore, the atonement of Christ was necessary to sustain and honor the broken law of God, to vindicate his authority, and satisfy his glorious justice." Now we see how easy it is for the believers of this theory to state it intelligibly and boldly. But how comes it that they have to state it in words and phrases of their own? If the sacred writers had wished to state it, nothing would have been easier. But where is there a sentence within the covers of the Bible that can be quoted as explicitly advancing it? We do not hesitate to say, with all the frankness and positiveness of full conviction, that there is not a line or a phrase of Scripture that affirms such a doctrine. Divines have to state it in their own terms, because Scripture terms fail them. Of course we are well aware that there are passages in the Bible which are constructively and inferentially turned to support this dogma. But the constructions and the inferences are the very matters in debate. Having entered our distinct protest here, with an honest and sufficient reason for it, we must follow the reasoning which proceeds *on a human formula*.

Dr. Pond argues, it is necessary for God as the Supreme Ruler "to sustain law. He must not suffer his law to be trifled with and trampled on. He must maintain it inviolate in all its strictness and strength, its authority and purity, or his government of law will be subverted and overthrown." The law, he adds, can be sustained by punishing the transgressors as they deserve, by inflicting upon them the threatened penalty, and only in this way, unless some expedient can be devised by which the honor of the broken law, and the display of God's righteous regard for it, and all the ends of government, can be secured as fully, as perfectly, as they would be by inflicting the penalty. Without some such expedient, to pardon and save sinners would be a moral impossibility, intolerable under the government of God, inconsistent with its stability, its perfection, and even with its continued existence. The Professor does not stop to weigh the balance between the two conditions under which the law may be duly honored, nor to decide

by which of the two the ends of law, and the very idea of *Law*, may be vindicated. One of these is, the repentance in dust and ashes, in deepest contrition, of those who, having broken the law, have already suffered from it and by it, and who now honor it by suing with imploring hearts for forgiveness; taken in connection with the tribute also paid to the law by the sufferings of those who break it and do not repent. The other condition is, the visiting the penalty of a broken law on one who has not broken it, but has honored it in all its provisions. Which of these two conditions wins the nobler tribute, the more adequate satisfaction to an outraged law? Let the parent ask the question as it applies to family discipline. Are its ends better answered to him by the kneeling contrition and the importunate appeals for forgiveness of an erring child, or by requiring, or even allowing, an unoffending brother or sister to submit to a punishment? Would the parable of the prodigal son win a new attraction for our hearts, an enhanced power over our consciences, if the father had been represented as scourging the elder son before he embraced the younger?

Dr. Pond proceeds to argue, that the agency of Christ offered an expedient alternative to the suffering of sinners, for sustaining law, — not, however, through his perfect holiness, nor through his perfect obedience to the divine law, the merit of which obedience is imputed to us, as the old doctrine affirmed, — but *through his sufferings and death*, — “in the shedding of his blood.” In pronouncing upon the mode of the *efficacy* of Christ’s death, “the *manner* in which it *availed* to make an atonement for sin,” he rejects that element of the Catechism doctrine which teaches “that Christ by his suffering for us literally *paid our debt to divine justice*,” or that “he met *the strict and proper penalty of the law*,” as the fulfilment of these conditions would have required that Christ should have been the subject of the most hateful and painful passions, stings and reproaches of conscience, dissatisfaction with God, and the pains and agonies of the bottomless pit in eternal death. These Christ did not suffer. But he answered “the ends of justice.” “His death was *vicarious*. He died as a *substitute*.” “He endured, not the proper penalty of the law for us, but an adequate *substitute for that penalty*.”

"He offered a *fair and full equivalent* for the everlasting sufferings of all who shall be finally saved." In this view, Dr. Pond finds the reason why "Christ must have been just such a personage, God and man, divine and human, as he is represented in the Scriptures. Had he been a divine person only, he could not have made an atonement, because the divine nature cannot suffer and die. And had he been a human person only, he could not have made an atonement, because he would have been unable, without the divine nature, to endure the requisite amount of suffering, and he would have lacked that personal dignity and glory which impart such a value and efficacy to his death."

Now, if without the least feeling of disrespect to the writer of the last-quoted sentences, but with the simple purpose of expressing how tortuous is the idea which they present to our own minds, we may venture to paraphrase them, we must say that they seem to us to intimate that Christ's human nature needed the divine element, because the human nature could not suffer enough; and that the divine nature needed the human element, because the divine nature could not suffer at all. Is Christian doctrine answerable for such devices, or do they come of the brains of men?

Similar to these views of the Bangor Professor are the following, which we find in a recent devotional work, otherwise enriched with some of the choicest and most impressive lessons of Christian piety, conveyed in the most chaste and fervent language. We refer to "The Communion Sabbath," by Rev. Dr. N. Adams. The author says: "God alone was able to expiate the sin of his creatures, by taking man's nature into union with the Divine, in the person of the Word, and making satisfaction to justice by that which He saw to be equivalent in effect to the endless punishment of the race." (p. 34.) The author speaks of Christ as "expiating our guilt." (p. 37.) He also says: "The death of Christ was not a substitute for our crucifixion, but for our endless misery." (p. 63.)

Now if the denial, unreserved and emphatic, of this view — call it "the governmental theory," or by any other title — of what it was necessary, *in reference to God, and to God's law*, that Christ should do, and of what

Christ did, to open the way for our reconciliation with our Heavenly Father, — if this denial be indeed a denial of the Scripture doctrine of the Atonement, then Unitarians must needs submit to the charge, and meet it as they can. But not for one moment will Unitarians allow that this is the Scripture doctrine of the Atonement. They find no such doctrine in the Scriptures, but one quite unlike it. It is usual for Orthodox writers against us to assert that boastful reason and obduracy object to this doctrine, because of its humiliating character, because of its affront to human pride! But how differently do men judge of the same things! For ourselves, we must say that we know of no mounting fancy or conception among all the fabulous incarnations of Hindoo or Indian mythology, or among the apotheoses of Pagan idolatry, which offers such an incense to human pride as do some of the shapings of this popular doctrine of the Atonement. The charge against us has always seemed to us to be one of the most perverse distortions of truth which polemical inventiveness could devise. What is there humbling to human pride in the doctrine that God for our sakes (for his own sake, even!) condescended to such a method for our redemption? Were the subject of a monarch in captivity in a foreign land to send home to have a ransom provided for him, and were the monarch himself to go to redeem him, the last effect which we should look for would be that the redeemed captive should feel humbled by the transaction. He would boast it as the highest of his honors. The Orthodox doctrine seems to us, certainly in comparison with our own, to foster a surpassing conceit of human pride. But the implication intended to be conveyed by the Orthodox charge against us is, that we really find their doctrine in the New Testament, or, at least, have a misgiving that it is there, while we contumaciously resist it. Will they therefore give us the benefit of our own most sincere and earnest profession, that, with all the means which they have for understanding the Scriptures, and with as profound a sense of their value, and as single a purpose to know and obey their lessons, we find no such doctrine in them as Orthodoxy teaches?

We have stated that the antagonistic issue opened between Orthodoxy and Unitarianism, after long and

full debate, has committed us to the following position : That the Scriptures do not lay the emphatic stress of Christ's redeeming work upon his death, above or apart from his life, character, and doctrine ; and that his death, as an element of his redeeming work, is made effective for human salvation through its influence on the heart and life of man, not through its vicarious or substituted value with God, nor through its removal of an abstract difficulty in the Divine government which hinders the forgiveness of the penitent without further satisfaction. All the points now left in debate between the two parties are recognized in this summary statement. A brief reference to them, successively, will exhibit in as summary a way our denials of Orthodox positions, and the reason for such denials, and also the substance and grounds of our own doctrinal belief.

A few years ago Unitarianism was compelled to object that Orthodoxy laid the *whole* emphasis of Christ's redeeming work upon his death, upon his cross, his humiliation, his ignominy and sufferings. Of late the co-ordinate value of the life and doctrine of Christ has been acknowledged by some able Orthodox writers, though essential Calvinism and the formula of the Westminster Catechism made no account whatever of these elements of his redeeming work. His *merits* and *obedience* were recognized as prevailing with God, — not with man. Still we think that even the fullest recognition which we have ever met on any page of modern Orthodoxy does not do justice to the proportions of Scriptural truth on this point. No conviction lives more sincerely in the hearts of Unitarians than this, that the first erroneous bias of Orthodoxy arises precisely here. God forbid that we should write a word to depreciate the importance, the stress, or the value, in the whole work of redemption, of the cross, the death of Christ. But we do not fear this risk when our sole purpose is, not to compare the death of Christ with any other death, but to insist upon its relative aspect and proportions in connection with all else in him and by him. It is Christ's life, and Christ's character, and Christ's doctrine, which we would not have overshadowed by his cross.

Christ came into the world, as he said, to die for the world, and, in dying, to bear witness to the truth the knowl-

edge and obedience of which would insure eternal life to men. Thus his life, his character, and his doctrine are made the elements of his work. When these were displayed to men, they would bring him to his cross, while by that cross he would draw all men unto him. We have, then, to look to his life, character, and doctrine to find the purpose and the lesson of his death. But, in our view, Orthodoxy does violence to truth by impairing the proportion of its ingredients on these vast and solemn themes. Orthodoxy does not follow the harmony of Scripture in laying equal stress upon all that Christ was and taught and did. We do not charge Orthodoxy with laying too much stress upon the death of *Christ*, but with laying too much stress upon the *death* of Christ. The error of Orthodoxy here seems to us to lie in the same direction as does that of the Church of Rome, in the painful multiplication and obtrusion of its scenical and symbolical pictures of the crucifixion; its analytic representations of the incidents and instruments of the passion, as shown in the "Stations of the Cross," and in its elaborate ingenuities for keeping all the agonies of Calvary ever before the eye of the worshipper. The Scriptures do not thus isolate and emphasize the Saviour's sufferings. A misleading effect has been produced by the habit of Orthodox disputants, when arguing upon the cross of Christ, of selecting and bringing together from each separate document of the New Testament all the passages which refer to the death of the Saviour. It is forgotten that those documents were addressed by different writers to different communities, and the impression is designed or left that all the passages entered into each announcement or appeal of the Gospel. Indeed, if one could be content to go through the New Testament for the purpose of deciding by count or by the force of emphasis what one element of the Saviour's whole agency or history is chiefly insisted upon by the Apostles, he would probably find that his *resurrection* takes precedence of all others. Paul does not say, If Christ has not died, your faith is vain; but, "If Christ be not risen from the dead, then is our preaching vain: ye are yet in your sins." (1 Cor. xv. 14, 17.) It was his "hope of the resurrection of the dead," for which Paul was called in

question before the Pharisees. (Acts xxiii. 6.) When the Apostle enjoyed the coveted opportunity of addressing Felix and Drusilla concerning "the faith in Christ," the record tells us that "he reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come," with no reference to an expiatory offering made by Christ. And when he stood before King Agrippa to proclaim the hope and promise of the Gospel, there was the same silence about the expiation, and the same stress laid upon the doctrine of the resurrection. "Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you that God should raise the dead?" (Acts xxvi. 8.) "Jesus and the resurrection" were the strange things that Paul preached at Athens. (Acts xvii. 18, 20, 31, 32.)

Why, then, it may be asked, if the death of Christ is not made in Scripture to be the paramount and only emphatic incident in his manifestation to men,—why did he so die? Why was not his ministry terminated peacefully, gently, and by some natural process? We answer, at this stage of our argument,—leaving the point for further remark in another connection,—that a suffering end was the consistent termination of such a life and of such a work. The sacrificial character of his death—and we hold his death to have been sacrificial in the highest sense of the word—had been foreshadowed by every incident and element of his manifestation. In the body of flesh, through which he suffered on the cross, he had been humbled and tempted and scourged, and buffeted. The hands and feet which he showed to his disciples, pierced by the nails on Mount Calvary, had shared the toils and weariness of his ministry as the servant of all. How far the knowledge of "the decease which he should accomplish at Jerusalem," and of the method of it, may have pervaded and deepened the spirit of all his words and deeds, and given to what humanly we call his character its solitary perfectness and its fulness of heavenward consecration, it would be presumptuous in a disciple to judge. It is written of him, however, that he was himself "made perfect through suffering"; that the crowning grace of his soul was his triumph over mortal weakness; and that by his own endurance of trial he became the consoler and the supporter of those among whom his cross is divided. How

much of his fitness for his mediatorial work was secured by his own subjection in the flesh, we know not. But we have the knowledge of his life and ministry, which warrant us in saying that the only consistent termination of his life and work was that which closed it on the cross. His was a public life of outward severities, humiliations, and mortifications. To have ended it in retirement, on a peaceful couch in a private dwelling, under a gentle ministration such as his houseless lot had never shared, would not have been in harmony with its course and consecration. Not with reference to any legal exactions of the Almighty Father, but as addressed to the hearts of men, do we enter into the touching significance of such words as these, from the Saviour's own lips: "The Son of Man *must* suffer many things, and be rejected"; "He *must* be delivered into the hands of sinful men"; "He *must needs* have suffered and risen again from the dead"; and, on the walk to Emmaus, "*Ought* not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory?"

In the mean while the reconciling offices of Christ, as they are concentrated under the shadows of his cross, are distributed over the toils and the benedictive services of his life, are manifested in the graces of his character, and are set forth in his counsels, his appeals, his promises, and his personal ministry in the heart of a believer. His touch could heal; his word could forgive and save; his look could rebuke and win; his common converse could make hearts to burn within them; and his dying groan did but *finish* the work he had long been doing. It may be that the greater multitude of his disciples in every age have been won to him by the "power of his sufferings." Indeed, this result would follow, or would seem to follow, from the fact that his preachers have selected for stress and reiteration that single point of appeal. But confident we are, that, without diminution from the attractions of the cross, it may be affirmed that his life and character and doctrine, his grace and truth, his humility and patience and sinlessness, have secured him unnumbered believers in all time. The death of Christ takes we know not how much of its meaning from his life. The blessed power of sympathy in suffering in a world of sufferers, where disciples "must

drink of the cup and be baptized with the baptism" of their Master, is an influence which we dare not fathom or bound. We feel, however, that some of the most sacred and potent sway of Christ over the weary, the crushed, the woful and agonized, depends upon the fact, that the holiest and the tenderest sharer of our infirmities was "a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief." There is an intimation which we will not ungenerously force, but which we cannot but follow up in our thoughts as dropped by St. Paul, when, in a mysterious way, he says that he rejoiced in his sufferings, and filled up in his flesh that which was "lacking in the afflictions of Christ for his body's sake, which is the Church." It is as if the Apostle ventured to suggest that he would contribute even his own pains and agonies to fill out the sacred purpose of his Master's sufferings.

We come now to the vital point of the doctrinal difference between Unitarianism and Orthodoxy as regards the Atonement. Since we are now found to accord in the meaning of that word as expressing reconciliation, we accept the condition that the Scripture doctrine which we wish to define is — the agency of Christ in opening and preparing the way for a reconciliation between God and men. Keeping in view what has just been said respecting the whole agency of Christ in his life, his character, and his doctrine, we will now concentrate the issue upon his death. How is the death of Christ made efficacious for human salvation? What is the revealed method of its working to that result? The two parties to be reconciled are man, the sinning child, and God, the kind and righteous and offended Father; man, who is a debtor to the law, and God, whose just due and service have been denied him. Man is in the wrong, not God; man needs to be changed, not God; for he is ever waiting and willing to be gracious. There is a relation of hostility between the Father and the child, and Christ comes to mediate between them. His death, whether or not it has the chief efficacy, has at least the crowning agency in his mediatorial work of securing reconciliation. But how? Through what instrumentality, method, or process? We recognize two, and only two, directions in which we can look for an answer to this question. Orthodoxy looks in one

of these directions, and brings back a report which fixes its doctrine on this subject. Unitarianism looks in another direction, and accepts as a consequence another doctrine. We do not wish to avail ourselves of any dubiousness of language, of any confusion of terms, of any specious assumptions of a deceptive accord in opinions which are in fact radically different. We aim for candor, and we would rather overstate than understate our difference with Orthodoxy on this point. Clear-headed, out-spoken, frankly avowed conviction is what we all need here, — what the interests of truth, what the hopes of amity and tolerance, even amid differences, are rested upon. Orthodoxy regards the death of Christ as looking GOD-WARD for its efficacy. Unitarianism regards the death of Christ as looking MAN-WARD for its efficacy. If we have not in this distinction fairly and fully stated the whole issue between us, we beg that our error may be ascribed to our inability to comprehend and define the issue, not to any lack of right intent or desire to do so. We believe that we have expressed it fairly. Indeed, it is because we regard the Calvinistic theory in all its shapes and modifications as involving an influence in Christ's death which looks toward God for its efficacy, that we reject it in heart and faith, unreservedly and earnestly, as a heathenish and an unchristian doctrine.

The essential token of the Calvinistic or Orthodox scheme on this doctrine, whether characterized as a covenant between the Father and the Son, or centring upon the word *vicarious*, or *satisfaction*, or planting itself upon a "governmental theory," is that the efficacy of Christ's death works by its operation upon God, or some attribute of God, or upon some abstract difficulty in which he is involved by the laws of government he has himself established. Orthodoxy interposes a law between God and man which mercy cannot relax, but which only a victim can satisfy. God can freely forgive, but his law cannot freely remit a penitent offender. The essential token of the Unitarian scheme is that the whole operation of Christ's mediatorial death is upon the heart and life and spirit of man. We cannot confound or merge this fundamental distinction; it reaches deep; it rises high. Though Unitarianism may not undertake

to fathom, or comprehend, or give expression to all the mysterious influence and efficacy and mode of operation upon man and man's soul and destiny, though Unitarianism is free to acknowledge an unexplained and inexplicable agency in the sacrificial death of Christ, it nevertheless looks for it *all* in the direction of humanity, not in the direction of the Deity. We are ready for ourselves to go all the lengths of mysticism and mystification on this point, and to yield to the feeling of being on unsounded waters beneath unfathomed depths of ether. We are cheerfully willing to admit that God has comprehended influences in the sacrificial death of Christ which are designed to be efficaciously felt and mercifully availed of by us without yielding to the solution of our understanding. We can even accept some statements which we find in Orthodox pages about "a satisfaction made to law," by simply construing them as applying the sanction and penalties of the law to us through the sufferings of Christ for sin. We can accord well with the following remark of the great Bishop Butler: "How and in what particular way Christ's death had this efficacy [obtaining pardon], there are not wanting persons who have endeavored to explain; but I do not find that the Scripture has explained it. And if the Scripture has, as surely it has, left this matter of the satisfaction of Christ mysterious, left somewhat in it unrevealed, all conjectures about it must be, if not evidently absurd, yet at least uncertain."* We too would be willing to leave the matter unexplained. But our protest against the Orthodox scheme is, that, instead of ascribing the intelligible or the mysterious efficacy of Christ's death to its uses for offending, sinning, and repenting man, it makes a revolting dogma, or a needless device, and follows the sacrifice of the cross into the skies, as setting matters right between God and his own attributes of Justice and Mercy.

We are sensitive to any blurring of the dividing line between the God-ward or the Man-ward working of the efficacy of Christ's whole mediatorial office. We ask no compromise of opinion, we will make none whatever. We are impatient of any confusion of terms, any

* Analogy, Part II. Chap. V.

intermingling of distinctions, on this point. Reconciliation involves two conditions,—repentance in the offender, forgiveness on the part of the wronged. Or, if we add to the condition on the one side, we must qualify the grace on the other. If we require that the offender must not only repent, but make reparation, then we must recognize in the other party, not simple forgiveness, but the exacting of a satisfaction. As God is revealed as forgiving iniquity, he consents to forego satisfaction; and as man is unable to make reparation, he is required to offer penitence. We cannot attribute forgiveness where repentance and reparation are both demanded, for then the remission is not of grace, but by payment. We can neither fetter God's administration with laws which restrict his prerogative of mercy, nor take the benignity out of his forgiveness by attaching a purchase to its exercise.

Unitarianism, in opposition to Orthodoxy, maintains that the death of Christ, so far as its efficacy is distinctly defined, is instrumental to our salvation through its influence on the heart and life of man, not through its vicarious value with God; and also that revelation does not acquaint us with any obstacle in the method of administration which God has established as his government, which prevents his exercising mercy to the penitent except through the substitution of a victim to law.

And here, for the sake of averting an erroneous and an injurious judgment often visited by Orthodoxy upon our views, let a simple statement be strongly made. Orthodoxy, not through warrant of anything which Unitarianism proclaims, but by one of the unkind arts of controversy, attempts to confine our construction of the atoning death of Christ to the power and service of an example. We protest against the charge: we repel it. What some Unitarians may have recognized as a subsidiary and incidental lesson from the cross of Christ, ought not to be thus represented as exhausting our view of it. It is not our doctrine that the death of Christ becomes efficacious to us as an example, or even that it is especially needed or available in that direction. Christ is to us a victim, a sacrifice: his death was a sacrificial death. Its method and purpose and influence

fix a new, a specific, a peculiar, an eminent meaning to the word *sacrifice*, when used of him. Indeed, the highest and most sacred signification of the word ought for ever to be associated with *his* sacrifice. But, in conformity with that deciding distinction already made as settled by the terms of a God-ward or a Man-ward intent in the cross, we regard Jesus as a sacrifice *for man*, but not as a sacrifice *to God*. The difference is an infinite one, as indicated by those two prepositions attached respectively to the creature and the Creator. We regard Christ as a victim offered by human sin for human redemption; as one who could not have been our Redeemer but by being "faithful unto death," and as a willing sacrifice for our redemption. He was led as a lamb to the slaughter, and his murderers, as the Prophet had foretold that they would, had wrongly "esteemed him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted." (Isaiah liii. 4.) But instead of being "stricken of God," he was "wounded for our iniquities." "He tasted death for every man"; not *eternal* death, but death. He was nailed to the cross to secure our salvation, but not to make reparation for our sins to God.

If reconciliation between man and God be the object of the death, as of the life, the character, and the doctrine of Christ, the process for securing that reconciliation requires that the party who has been wronged shall announce first on what terms he will grant it, and that the offending party shall then yield to those terms. Men are the party in the wrong; they are to be brought to a sense of their sin, to be made acquainted with the terms which God proposes for forgiveness, and induced to comply with them. So complete has been the perversion of the simple Scripture terms of reconciliation which Orthodox views have for ages made current in the world, that there has been an actual inversion of the relations of parties. How frequently do Orthodox writers, as if wholly unconscious of the strange liberty which they take in wresting Scripture, allow themselves to speak of Christ as "reconciling *God* to us," instead of following Scripture, which always speaks of Christ as "reconciling *us* to God"! Indeed, the second of the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England, as also of the Episcopal Church in this country, speaks of

Christ's manifestation as designed "to reconcile his Father to us"! Such are the risks of false doctrine.

What, then, are the terms of reconciliation which God announces through Christ to men? The terms on which God offers forgiveness are such a faith in Christ as will lead us to realize his doctrine of our sinfulness, our hostility and alienation from God, and our consequent state of danger and condemnation; and further, such a faith in Christ as will persuade us of his authority to promise forgiveness on our repentance and future obedience, while at the same time we avail ourselves of those conditions and yield to the constraining influences of God's Holy Spirit. These are the terms which Unitarianism recognizes for reconciliation to God through Jesus Christ. If God will give us grace to fulfil these conditions, we will compound with ourselves for all anxiety about every "Governmental Theory" which the fancies of theologians can conjure up.

Orthodoxy recognizes these same terms of reconciliation, but adds to them another, looking, not man-ward but God-ward, for its necessity and its efficacy. Orthodoxy argues that violated law requires not only such a recognition of its authority as is offered to the lawgiver by a penitent offender, but also a victim, an expiation, to sustain and vindicate its honor. As God is the representative of that law, he requires that a substitute suffer for the penitent offender in order thus to sustain the authority of law. Christ was that suffering substitute to outraged law for us, and one of the effects of true and saving faith in him is to make us partakers in the merits of his God-ward sacrifice.

As Scripture affords not a single sentence which, even by the aid of a gloss or a false construction, can be used as a formula for stating *all the elements* comprehended in this Orthodox dogma, we will present some of the simplest announcements of it which we have found in the writings of theologians. Bishop Butler, all whose words seem to have been weighed in the scales of a calm and cautious wisdom, says: "Some have endeavored to explain the efficacy of what Christ has done and suffered for us, beyond what the Scripture has authorized; others, probably because they could not explain it, have been for taking it away, and confining his

office as Redeemer of the world to his instruction, example, and government of the Church. Whereas the doctrine of the Gospel appears to be, not only that he taught the efficacy of repentance, but rendered it of the efficacy which it is, by what he did and suffered for us; that he obtained for us the benefit of having our repentance accepted unto eternal life; not only that he revealed to sinners that they were in a capacity of salvation, and how they might obtain it, but moreover that he put them into this capacity of salvation by what he did and suffered for them,—put us into a capacity of escaping future punishment, and obtaining future happiness.” He had before recognized it as among the teachings of revelation, “that the rules of the Divine government are such as not to admit of pardon immediately and directly upon repentance, or by the sole efficacy of it.” He afterwards adds, in reference to the supposed Scriptural view of the purpose designed in Christ’s sufferings, “Its tendency to vindicate the authority of God’s laws, and deter his creatures from sin, has never yet been answered, and is, I think, plainly unanswerable; though I am far from thinking it an account of the whole of the case.” “Let reason be kept to, and if any part of the Scripture account of the redemption of the world by Christ can be shown to be really contrary to it, let the Scripture, in the name of God, be given up; but let not such poor creatures as we go on objecting against an infinite scheme, that we do not see the necessity or usefulness of all its parts, and call this reasoning.”*

This moderation is the very majesty of wisdom. Let us see what the modern Orthodoxy of New England says on the same point. Dr. Woods tells us, that “all the influence of repentance results from the death of Christ. Repentance is a means on our part of obtaining the good purchased by Christ’s death.” “Christ’s death was appointed by God as a substitute for the punishment of sinners; it answered the same purposes; it made substantially the same display of God’s attributes and the principles of his government, and has the same efficacy, though far superior in degree, to promote the permanent welfare of his kingdom.” “A brief defi-

* Analogy, Part II. Chap. V.

nition of the Atonement, then, might be given in some such manner as this: It is Christ's obedience unto death, even the death of the cross in the place of sinners, for the purpose of vindicating the violated law, manifesting the righteousness of God, making expiation for sin, and procuring forgiveness, sanctification, and eternal life for all believers."* The strange confusion of ideas and terms which necessarily attaches to the Orthodox theology, presents a specimen of itself in the following sentences, when compared together. In his Eighth Letter to Unitarians, Dr. Woods says: "God would never have saved sinners, had not Christ interposed and made an atonement." Yet in his Ninth Letter he says: "It is uniformly the sentiment of the Orthodox, that the origin, the grand moving cause of redemption, was the infinite love, benignity, or mercy of God."

Very frequently we find the point of the Orthodox doctrine thus sharply presented: "Repentance is the *condition* of forgiveness with God, but the death of Christ is the *ground* on which that condition is effectual." "The *ground* of salvation is the completed work, the atoning merits of our Lord Jesus Christ: the *condition* of their bestowal on an individual is repentance." Such formulas as the following we might quote from many writers:—"The sufferings and death of Christ were necessary to make the exercise of the divine mercy to men consistent with the maintenance of divine justice." "Christ died for the purpose of removing an obstacle in the divine government, in the way of extending pardon to the penitent."

The Orthodox doctrine of the Atonement may, therefore, be regarded as concentrated now upon this "governmental theory," and as standing or falling with the proof or the failure of proof that this theory, owing nothing to the wit or fancy of man, is positively and clearly taught in the Scriptures. We have seen how positively and clearly its believers can state it, and this raises our demand, that, putting aside their own formulas, they should offer us instead "the law and the testimony," *and give us at least one text which includes all its essential terms.* It is something, however, to have the old shap-

* Dr. Woods's Works, Vol. II. pp. 404, 453, 463.

ings and concomitants once attached to the doctrine, as by good Mr. Flavel, withdrawn from our current religious literature. Those who, as professors in divinity schools, and as men of eminent distinction as theologians, are educating a new generation of ministers, will very soon introduce more or less important modifications in the popular belief by different constructions of this governmental theory. The fluctuations and tonings down of opinion which have reached that form of doctrinal statement are not likely to stop with it. If with due modesty we may intimate a conviction which the tendencies of thought, with some recent striking examples of the result of those tendencies, lead us to hold in strong assurance, we will say that this legal view of Christ's death must and will yield to a profounder Christian philosophy. Its best recommendation, its strength, consisted in the relief which it afforded to Orthodox believers when they were pressed by the objections to a more repulsive theory. It still has a strong sway over the sentiments; it will fail when tested by textual criticism and the logic of truth. Within the month, we have read three very able arguments against it by men who were educated to defend it, from three such different quarters as the Scotch Church, through J. McLeod Campbell, the English Church, by B. Jowett, and the Baptist Church in this country, by Dr. Sheldon. We must devote our little remaining space to a brief mention of a few of our many objections to this last phase of the old Orthodox doctrine of the Atonement. It might seem needless, yet, to avert misunderstanding or misrepresentation, we will here remind all readers, that we are not bringing our reason to bear against a doctrine of revelation, which may God forbid our ever doing, but against what we pronounce to be a human dogma constructively ascribed to revelation. It is against the Orthodox formula that we reason,—the formula which affirms that God, in order that he may exercise mercy towards the penitent, requires or accepts an expiatory offering made by innocence to his own law.

A governmental theory implies, in this use of the phrase, a law which restrains, or at least regulates, the perfect freedom of the working of the Divine administration over men. It was a prime essential in revelation

to make known this theory to us if it be true. But where are we to look for it in the explicit teachings of Scripture? What sentences, what single sentence, can be quoted as offering a direct, or even an indirect, intimation of it? Not one! This fettering himself with conditions of his own law, within which alone God can exercise the pardoning prerogative of a Supreme Monarch, must either have always attached to the Divine rule over men, or it must have been introduced in connection with the revelation of the Gospel by Jesus Christ. Now any single case by which, on the authority of inspiration, full forgiveness was promised on simple repentance, without reference to any implied or reserved condition, would prove that the Divine administration, as revealed to men, did not always recognize this limitation of the prerogative of mercy. Will any one venture to assert, that there are not many such cases plainly brought before us in the Old Testament? But when we allege any such case in which forgiveness is explicitly promised to repentance without a hint of any reserved condition, Orthodoxy makes a bold interpolation to meet the straits of its own theory, and urges that prospective faith in the mediatorial sacrifice of Christ was still the implied ground of the forgiveness. What violent dealing with Scripture would be necessary for the sake of interpolating this theory, will appear if we attempt to make the required insertion into any text. Thus, when Ezekiel says that a wicked man turning from his iniquities shall be forgiven and shall live, we must supply the words, "through the efficacy of a sacrifice which the expected Messiah is to offer to God." The emphatic sentence, "I will have mercy and not sacrifice," must be made to read, "I will exercise mercy *on condition of* a sacrifice." Jesus Christ emphatically announced the pardoning method of God's grace for penitent and renewed sinners, as exercised independently of any agency of his own. This method must, therefore, have been applicable to, and available for, those who lived before it was confirmed by his announcement of it. It must be as available for those who might never know of his announcement of it, as for Christians who receive it from his Gospel. It is in strict conformity with this view, as we learn from the Jewish Scrip-

tures, that there was no other condition attached in the former revelation to the promise of Divine forgiveness than penitence for the past and subsequent obedience. What else is the significance of such beautiful passages as the following, which gem the Old Testament: "To the Lord our God belong mercies and forgivenesses, though we have rebelled against him." (Daniel ix. 9.) "He that covereth his sins shall not prosper; but whoso confesseth and forsaketh them shall have mercy." (Prov. xxviii. 13.) "For thou desirest not sacrifice. The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit." (Psalm li. 16, 17.)

Such were the explicit and benignant terms on which the pardoning prerogative of God was exercised before the mission of Christ. If we had only the Old Testament to instruct us, it may safely be affirmed that not a single believer or reader of it would imagine a governmental theory as standing between God and the exercise of his sovereign mercy. Christ came from God to proclaim a free and universal Gospel from the Father of all, to extend the blessings heretofore restricted to Jews to all the nations of the earth. In announcing the terms of the Divine forgiveness, did Christ introduce any alteration in those which were in force before? Did he take from them or add to them? In proclaiming anew the Divine mercy, did he make our enjoyment of it depend upon anything that he was himself to do or suffer with a view to satisfy God? Is his mediation, besides its manifest purpose of bringing us to repentance, designed to complement the deficiencies of that repentance as a tribute to the Divine administration? Did the death of Christ manifest that God had imposed a new condition for the exercise of his free grace? No! There is no evidence that Christ uttered one word about this governmental theory. It certainly does not appear in any case in which he himself announced forgiveness to the penitent. It is not recognized in the Parable of the Prodigal Son. We do indeed read in that parable of the killing of a fatted calf, in connection with the forgiveness and welcome of the repentant profligate; but it was to heighten the joy of a festival, not as the victim of outraged law. We find no hint of this theory in the Lord's Prayer, which teaches us to look for forgiveness from God on condition that we forgive others; nor any

hint of it in the absolution of the penitent woman, who was forgiven much because she loved much, and loved much because she was forgiven much. And let it be observed with emphasis, that if Christ impaired or restricted the terms of free forgiveness in the older dispensation, the Gospel, instead of being a freer and a wider, becomes a narrower covenant. The attempt to evade this objection by assigning to the penitents of the old dispensation a prospective faith or an anticipated interest in a sacrifice to God's law, to be offered by Christ, is a mere device of theologians, — a pure figment of their own fancy.* The governmental theory is compelled to cover with its benefit Jews who cannot be shown to have had any knowledge of it, and then it stands perplexed as to what it shall decide concerning the fate of the heathen, who certainly had no knowledge of it. This is indeed a sore perplexity to Orthodoxy. We take the substance of the sublime revelation made through Peter concerning a heathen man, — "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is accepted with him" (Acts x. 34, 35), — as declaring a method of the merciful rule which our Father in heaven exercises over his children, independently of any grace won for them by a meritorious offering from Christ. It proves, at any rate, that God could show mercy to those who had never heard of Christ, and who had no conscious sense of obligation for his death. But Orthodoxy is confounded here by its own inventions. We have seen how decidedly Mr. Flavel and Dr. Hopkins utter themselves as to the hopelessness of the heathen. Bishop Butler was wiser on this point. In a note to the chapter which we have already quoted, he deprecates the inference, from anything that he says, "that none can have the benefit

* A fair specimen of the ingenuity of theologians in supplying the omissions of Scripture by the baldest inventions of their own fancy, is offered in the following sentence from the younger Edwards: "Did not Abraham and all the saints who lived before the incarnation of Christ, and who were informed that atonement was to be made for them by Christ, sincerely consent to it and earnestly desire it?" (Second Sermon on Grace consistent with Atonement. New Haven, 1785.) We do indeed read of those who "desired" to see and know in what the scheme of Revelation was to issue, without being gratified. But Edwards tells us that they not only knew, but *consented* to it!

of the general redemption, but such as have the advantage of being made acquainted with it in the present life." We find, too, that Orthodox theologians of the present day, who by the solvent of their philosophy make their creed elastic, are quite willing to allow that the expiatory sacrifice of Christ, as a legal offering, will impart its fullest benefits to multitudes who have had no knowledge of it. But what this admission gains in one direction it loses in another. For it is an express recognition that repentance is the actual condition of salvation for many, and the sole ground of it as known to them; that the death of Christ is so exclusively legal and Godward in its efficacy, that no motive or sentiment drawn from it is absolutely essential for its operation to the benefit of men; and also that the mediatorial office of Christ in heaven bears no definite relation to its scope on the earth. Now, if that expiation can avail for multitudes who are ignorant of it, and who draw no conscious motive or impulse from it, why should it be wholly nugatory, or even condemnatory, as it is said to be, for those who, finding every other grace in Christ, cannot believe that God required or that Christ made any legal expiation for them? Besides, the theory in this point of view is liable to much of the objection urged by Protestants to that of the supererogatory merits of the saints, by which a large balance of excess of merits was supposed to be set against the account of the eminently pious, and to be available to supply the deficiencies of those for whom these saints would intercede with God. Orthodoxy, in its milder moods, gives promise of salvation to the heathen, not from the unexhausted fulness of God's fount of mercy, but from the infinite balance entered upon the ledger-book of heaven to the atoning merits of Christ.

If it be asked, Why, under our view of the Gospel as proclaiming essentially the same message of free forgiveness on repentance which the elder dispensation announced, we should depend on Christ at all, and why we do not revert to the Old Testament Scriptures for our teaching? — we answer, that we are not Jews, but Gentiles, and that as Gentiles we receive the doctrine which we teach from Christ, as resting upon his authority. He is to us what the Law was to the

Jews. And this doctrine is, after all, the real point of harmony between the two dispensations.

Looking with a keen and earnest scrutiny into the terms of this governmental theory, we try them by the tests of Scripture, the logic of truth, and the uses of piety. The theory involves two conditions, both of which must be united in its statement, and be authenticated as its warrant:—

First, that suffering of an intense character must in some form or shape be offered by the guilty or the innocent as a tribute to the violated law of God; and that Divine mercy cannot possibly remit this penalty without making grace overthrow righteousness.

Second, that the death of Christ, by a method and in a compound nature which so intensified his agonies for a few hours as to make them an equivalent for the eternal woe of a doomed race of human beings, *is looked upon by God* as offering to him and to his law that needful penalty.

From the first verse of Genesis to the last verse of the Apocalypse, the Bible will be searched in vain for a sentence which expresses either of these two terms of the governmental theory. The search for a sentence which contains them both may therefore be pronounced hopeless. Give us one such sentence from the lips of Christ, or by authority from him, and we will accept the theory as of revelation from God. The Bible knows nothing of a Divine Mercy bound in the chains of Legality. Mercy is there represented as the supreme attribute of God, and not as needing a device to compensate its relaxing of judgment. The limitless expanses of the universe, the unmeasured space up from the earth to the heaven in one direction, and from the east to the west in another, are made the measurements of its scope. "Mercy rejoiceth against judgment," and rejoiceth over it,—not one word being interposed about legality. The God who from the infinite fountain of his love can forgive, can from the mildness of his sceptre remit.

We object to the governmental theory, that it is altogether an inferential, constructive theory, artificially wrought out by the brains of theologians, not distinctly revealed nor directly taught in the Scriptures. Take the simplest form of language in which it has ever been

stated, and observe how far short of its assertion any passage of the Scripture will fall that may be quoted in proof of it. We grant that Orthodoxy, by the aid of *inference* and *construction* and *ingenuity*, can make out an argument of considerable plausibility in support of this theory. By culling and bringing together scattered texts of Scripture, and relying upon the associations which for a length of time have been attached to them through the sharper view of the doctrine of the Atonement, and then by skilfully arranging these texts and assimilating their repelling elements by a logic quite natural to theologians, a marvellous show of apparent authority may be claimed for the theory. In practised hands, guided by an earnest heart and a mind already prepossessed by Orthodox influence, the theory admits of quite a forcible statement. When subtilty of reasoning, and partiality of interpretation, and ardent piety qualified by the restraints of dogma, engage upon this theory, the result even looks formidable to some who feel that they are held to withstand it. The strength of the theory now lies in old associations attached to texts under the influence of another view of the sacrificial doctrine. A perfect mosaic-work of symbols, phrases, and sentences, picked from between the covers of the Bible, polished down and filled in and held together by the cement of human ingenuity, is made to produce, by a highly artificial process, such a representation as will answer to an immolated victim who is pleading with Heaven, not with earth. Certain glowing Orientalisms of speech which have a free and lofty spiritualism, and some ritualistic images of quite a different tone, are wrought together, and petrified into hard literalisms, and stiffened into forms which, when reproduced in our own language, are false to the truth. As Mr. Jowett has remarked in his *Essay on the Atonement*, — so significant a production as coming from an Oxford theologian, — “Where the mind is predisposed to receive this theory, there is scarcely a law or a custom or rite or purification or offering in the Old Testament which may not be transferred to the Gospel.” It has often been cast as a reflection upon Unitarians, that in their discourses they have allowed some of the sacrificial terms applied to Christ in the Epistles to fall out of their common use.

We know not but that the censure has the apparent justification of fact. But if so, it would be averted by those whom it concerns, by the plea, that, though Unitarian theologians find no difficulty whatever, nor the slightest embarrassment, in the real significance of such terms, they do believe that very erroneous associations have warped and perverted them for popular use. Mr. Jowett has admirably indicated the process by which the writers of those Epistles through force of their own previous associations with the shambles and altars of sacrifice, were led to cast some of their Christian conceptions in the mould of their own former ideas. If to this fact—a fact which critical Scripture students will less and less be disposed to question as their noble toil advances—be added an allowance for the associations which Calvinistic theology has connected with the sacrificial terms of the Epistles, we should find it no difficult work to justify a temporary disuse of some phrases of misconstrued Scripture. When popular views have been recast, and popular belief has been conformed to the Scriptural doctrine, old language and old imagery may suggest their true meaning.

But we have dropped that plea in defence of others; for ourselves we do not need it. We also have gathered together every sentence from the New Testament, and from the Old too, which Orthodoxy works into the mosaic composition and statement of its governmental theory. We have the fair transcript before us. We know, we think we know, the force and meaning of such sentences, and the significance of most of them. And again we say, that they do not contain or intimate either, much less both, of the two conditions stated above as entering into the governmental theory. It is claimed that the Orthodox have a great advantage over us in this, that while we have to make a somewhat vague and undefined statement to express the mode of efficacy of the death of Christ, they are able to state it very definitely. True. But while *they* have to state it in terms and phrases and formulas of their own, instead of allowing *Scripture* to state it for them, the advantage on their side is at least neutralized. We had rather take refuge under the large ambiguities of some Scripture phrases, than define them rigidly by adding phrases of our own.

While we have laid down our pen within the last hour, we have read the following sentence in the columns of the week's paper of our "Congregationalist" brethren (May 2): "The Lamb of God, slain for the *forgiveness* of human sins." The sentence is a very definite one; but it is equally unwarrantable as a most startling perversion of Scripture.

The Bible teaches us that the whole plan of redemption, with all its incidents and stages, was contemporaneously arranged in the Divine mind. It was a continuous scheme slowly developed to the knowledge and experience of man. Inspired prophets caught anticipatory glimpses of stages in it which were not to be realized till long after their day. The scheme was to culminate in a suffering Messiah. The Lamb was slain, his death was foreseen at the very commencement of the dispensation: "before the foundation of the world." Now the fact that the scheme *results* in the death of Christ has led to the inference that the death of Christ under a legal view of its purpose was really the *substance* of the scheme, and that, as no stage of it had any significance except what it derives from the result, so the legal view of the death of Christ is in truth the whole substance of the scheme of revelation. If this is not an inferential and constructive theory, we should be at loss to find one among all the conceptions of human brains. We believe that each step and process in the scheme was complete in its operation for its own date in time, and for the subjects of it. The old Hebrews did indeed "drink of the spiritual rock which followed them, which rock was Christ," but it was because the virtue of the whole scheme was concentrated in every element in it. "The mystery which had been hid from ages and generations" was the result which was "made manifest" only to Christians; but its blessings were not deferred till its disclosure, nor made dependent on the method of its disclosure.

Orthodoxy enters into an elaborate argument to prove that the sacrificial offerings of the Old Testament were all typical of the great sacrifice, and took their validity from that. How inconclusive and defective and inconsistent that argument is, will, we think, appear to every one who will examine it without prepossession. It fails

at the application of each test of criticism, evidence, authority, and analogy. Not the most distant intimation is given in the Old Testament that the ritual sacrifices looked beyond themselves to an anticipation of the sacrifice of Christ. Not a word can be quoted from Law-giver, Prophet, or Priest, to prove that such a reference was had in view. The aim and efficacy of those sacrifices were complete in themselves; and a close study of all that is enjoined in connection with those sacrifices will persuade us of the very slight importance attached to them except in a ceremonial way. They are not invested with the awe, nor set forth with the solemnity, which would belong to them as the shadows cast back from the cross. The only one of all the offerings of the Jews which was said to "bear the sin of the people," was not immolated, sacrificed, or slain, but was sent off into the wilderness. It is remarkable, likewise, that the Levitical sacrifices were enjoined in a routine way, without the slightest reference to the state of mind or feeling with which they were offered. It was not them *and repentance*, according to the priestly ritual, but *them* alone. The Prophets seem even to have stood as protesters against the Priests in this matter, in insisting upon the worthlessness of the offering except as it indicated a contrite heart, which was the better of the two. But what the Prophets thus insisted upon as the greater, namely, humiliation, contrition, and repentance, the governmental theory would persuade us were all secretly subordinated to a prospective sacrifice. When we quote to our opponents the sentiment approved by Jesus, — that to love God and one's neighbor "is more than all whole burnt-offerings and sacrifices" (Mark xii. 33), — the reply is, "that is the very loftiest and most exacting demand of the Law, exhaustive, impossible of obedience by us, and therefore, as we do not come up to it, we need a sacrifice for us." No! we rejoin. We need mercy. In no instance recorded does Christ make a retrospective reference to the effect that he is giving efficacy to the repentance of penitents under the old dispensation. Nor can any assertion be quoted as from him, that under all circumstances, whenever and wherever a sinner is redeemed and saved, it is on condition or in consequence of his death.

Yet not only from the Jewish, but even from the heathen sacrifices, would Orthodoxy draw types and foreshadowings of a great legal victim. The foul and impious offerings of Paganism, brute and human, with all their revolting horrors, are made to yield one gleaming ray of pure light as testifying to the strong instinctive conviction of the human heart that God must be approached, even by penitence, with a propitiation. When we attempt to bring home to our thoughts the fearful reality intimated in this incidental illustration of the governmental theory, so intense is the horror which it excites, that, were it not for the restraining influence of Christian respect for those with whom we differ, we should charge them with confounding the purest and holiest element of the Gospel with the most hideous element of heathenism. We utterly and almost indignantly reject this dreadful fancy. We reject it alike in its use of heathen and of Jewish sacrifices. It seems to us a most degrading view of the redeeming work of the holy Jesus to say that his final offering of love had been foreshadowed for ages in the sacrifices of brute beasts. Strained visions of prophets and kings, longing hopes of devout hearts in humble scenes of life, and angelic anthems ringing their symphonies in the ears of shepherds, are the befitting heraldings of "the desire of all nations." But the bloody shambles of fed beasts and the reeking altars of a blinded idolatry, are images which no transfiguration can elevate into types of the Lamb of God.

God had forbidden the Jews to offer human sacrifices, as abhorrent to him. We tremble as we ask the question which forces itself upon us, — Would God signalize the abrogation of the Jewish code by offering for men a human victim, and thus make the crowning act of human sin the essential condition for the expiation of all sin? It is Mr. Jowett of Oxford who uses the words, "the greatest of human crimes, that redeems the sin of Adam by the murder of Christ."

We have said, that we had before us all the passages from the Bible which connect our redemption with the sufferings of Christ, and that we had weighed their import, without finding in them either, still less both, of the terms involved in the governmental theory. We

are not about to quote those passages to show how each of them falls short of authenticating that theory. With the briefest glance over specimen passages of such a tenor, we gather sentences like these:—"he hath borne our griefs"; "he was wounded for our transgressions"; "the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed"; "his soul" [his life] was made "an offering for sin"; "he bore our sins"; "he purged our sins"; "he suffered for our sins"; he died "for the remission of our sins"; he "laid down his life for us"; "he redeemed us to God by his blood" [his death]; "he gave his life a ransom for many"; "he was delivered for our offences"; "he is the propitiation [the mercy-seat] for the sins of the whole world." But where in all these sentences, looking *man-ward* for all the solemn and sacrificial efficacy of the sufferings they express, do we find any intimation of a God-ward design, necessity, or working of a legal expiation? We read, "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." It is the *sin* which he takes away. But the governmental theory would require the passage to read, "who taketh away the *punishment* of the world." We read, that "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the Law, being made a curse for us." (Gal. iii. 13.) Leaving unnoticed the confusion caused to our minds by the use of the word Law to define both the Mosiac and the moral law, which makes us uncertain whether the Apostle meant more than that the death of Christ relieved Gentiles from subjection to the old legal code, we remind ourselves that it was man, not God, who made Christ "a curse," and treated him as if he were accursed. We read, "For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin." (2 Cor. v. 21.) The Rev. A. P. Stanley, of Oxford, Canon of Canterbury, in his recent work on the Epistles to the Corinthians, construes the passage thus: "He was enveloped, lost, overwhelmed in sin and its consequences, so far as he could be without himself being sinful." And he paraphrases it thus: "The object for which He devoted the sinless One to the world of sin was, that I, and you with me, might, through and with that sinless One, be drawn into the world of righteousness." The scholarly works of Jowett and Stanley are most profitable study for those who are

resolved that the Apostles shall not use a single trope, or other rhetorical figure, without having it urged into a literal interpretation. If a thousand passages of a tenor similar to the above were to be quoted from Scripture, they would all fail of conveying, by any fair interpretation, an idea of Christ's death as a sacrifice *to God*. There is indeed one passage which speaks of Christ's offering for us as "a sacrifice to God." But the very aroma of the phrase connected with it relieves it of its literal construction. The sacrifice of Christ must have been of such a nature, that we can regard it as "a sweet-smelling savor" to God. (Eph. v. 2.) The song of the redeemed in the Apocalypse to Christ is, "Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood [thy death]." (Rev. v. 9.) This is the burden of the whole Gospel strain. But where do we find in it an intimation of the legal theory of a substituted victim to God? It is characteristic of all the figures of speech used in the Scriptures, that they are constantly varied, played upon, presented in changing aspects, balancing and mutually explaining each other. Christ is not only called the Redeemer, but also the *ransom money*; not only the payer of our debt, but also the *price* of our discharge; he not only bears or takes up, lifts and carries, our *sins*, but he also bears our *diseases*. But who would force either of these terms to such an interpretation as would compel us to say that Christ became palsied, deaf, and blind, in the process of relieving human maladies? The very variety of the symbols and images used concerning him indicates that they are symbols and images.

If we submit the governmental theory to the test of logic, we find it assailable and vulnerable at the very points in which it most needs to be strong. It may be a misconception of our own, but we think we discern in most modern statements a shrinking from a full, direct, unqualified expression of it, while affectionate and deprecatory phrases are connected with it. Now if it is to be asserted, let it be with all the frankness and boldness becoming a fundamental theory of the relations between God and man. To our minds, the title of legality, the very idea and substance of law in the sense of equity, are perverted in the theory. We are told that the law is

outraged, and the sanctions of justice are defied, if the guilty, even when penitent, are freely forgiven. But into our very idea of law enters the condition, that the penalties of its violation, if inflicted at all, shall be visited on the transgressor. Which contingency would the more peril our reverence for law, the remission of its penalties, or the infliction of them on the innocent? Etymologists derive our word *mercy* from the Latin *merces*, a reward or payment; and they tell us that the connection, which is in fact a separation, of the meanings is to be explained thus,—that when the next of kin to a murdered person received a money equivalent for the murder, he yielded to the payment and returned mercy. It is a most tortuous definition, and is, we think, in this respect, similar to the working of the governmental theory. When Orthodoxy fetters God's exercise of mercy by the restraints of his penal law, it forgets that the Divine Lawgiver can harmonize his own laws of justice and of mercy. Mr. Jowett says, in his *Essay on the Atonement*, that the theory affirms "that there were some impossibilities in the nature of things which prevented God from doing otherwise than he did. Thus we introduce a moral principle superior to God, just as in the Grecian mythology fate and necessity are superior to Jupiter." He also says, that the view of the sufferings of Christ, as a sort of "satisfaction to God," "interposes a painful fiction between God and man." Orthodoxy makes the difficulty which it professes to find for God in looking for a device for mediating between his mercy and his justice. Not regarding penitence as a competent mediation, it interposes a victim. The Apostle speaks of God's being "just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus," as if the two assertions were identical. Orthodox pleaders are in the habit of interpolating the word *yet* in the sentence, thus, "and *yet* the justifier," &c., as if the two assertions needed reconciling. Even Professor Stuart makes that interpolation when he quotes the passage.

We shrink from following the lead of Orthodox disputants into the dread audacity of seeking to define and measure the degree of intensity in the sufferings endured by Christ. Sure we are, that no statement of Scripture presents the question of the *amount* of those sufferings

as deciding their *purpose*. If there be one point in this controversy which, from the shock it causes to our sensibilities, we should pronounce to be forbidden ground to all parties, it is this. We have much of bold and offensive assertion upon it, copied from various writers lying before us, but we forbear to transfer it to our pages. Calvin, arguing from the Saviour's momentary dismay, that his sufferings were more than human, says: "What disgraceful effeminacy would this have been to be so distressed by the fear of a common death, as to be in a bloody sweat, and incapable of being comforted without the presence of angels!"* But the younger Edwards emphatically declares that the suffering "was barely that of the *man* Christ Jesus," as "the Eternal Logos was not capable of enduring misery."† And yet there is something vital to the theory before us dependent upon the ascribing an intensified degree of suffering to Christ, in order that his suffering might be of infinite value. The Orthodox dogma is to us hopelessly confused here by variance of testimony and definition among its general advocates. Some, with Calvin and Hopkins, tell us that God died. Others tell us that this is impossible in fact, and unallowable in statement, while, like Dr. Pond, they ascribe some influence from the Divine nature to what was endured in the human nature of Christ. But Orthodoxy perils its theory by definitions and explanations. What was it for God to pass through the show of dying as a man? It could not be real tragedy. Was it a drama? No! It was *real* in what it was, not fiction in anything. The pleading petition of Christ, "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me!" is to us inexplicable, if Jesus had entered into a covenant with God by the terms of which he knew that the removal of an obstacle in the way of the exercise of Divine mercy to all our race depended upon his sacrifice to God. The petition needs no explanation, if, in conformity with the view we have presented of the consistency between such a close of his ministry and its whole tenor, Jesus for a moment addressed to his Father the struggle of his own spirit, "Must I drink of this cup?"

* Institutes, Book II. Chap. XVI.

† Third Sermon on Atonement and Free Grace.

If we wished to make an exhaustive statement of the objections to be offered against even the consistency of this legal theory with the elementary principles and the majestic equities of true law, we should need the space which we have already used. Especially should we urge with earnestness, that forgiveness on penitence does not in any case peril the authority of the Divine law. One who has truly repented needs no dramatic offering to impress him with an adequate sense of the evil of all sin. His own breast is the best testimony to him. The forgiven penitent is not harmed by the exercise of mercy toward him; the impenitent sinner is not hardened by the announcement of mercy to the contrite. All the attempted analogies which Orthodoxy tries to institute between school discipline, or human tribunals, and the Divine administration, fail at the most important points. Of course, a judge on the bench of a human court cannot discharge a professedly repentant criminal. The judge cannot know if the penitence be sincere, nor has the criminal sinned in matters which injure only that judge, nor does the judge make or execute the law. But do we err in intimating that, if by any infallible test human tribunals could know what criminals of every degree had thoroughly turned from all wickedness to righteousness, the voice of the merciful in a community might plead for their discharge? An analogy drawn between the parental government of a household and the Divine administration would give us the best illustration of what a mild but firm method of law and benignity requires. A kind parent asks only for contrition in an erring child. He forgives the penitent. His law is satisfied.

What shall we say, too, of this legal theory, as respects the terms by which God is to forgive all the sin that is ever henceforward to be committed by the unborn millions of our race who shall live on the earth? God has already received the funded payment which shall make their repentance available for forgiveness, says the theory. All coming sinners are to plead an interest in the past sacrifice of Christ. The victim which was by anticipation available for the penitents of old times, is by retrospection available for all future time. "How am I to be forgiven for the sins I may commit next year?"

asks one who hopes that up to to-day he is pardoned. "Draw upon the infinite fund of purchased grace," is the answer. Not in irony, not for offence upon the cherished convictions of any disciple, but in serious perplexity, in troubled anxiety, do we express something beyond mere misgivings here. And in the same spirit, deprecating intended offence, we utter what comes to our thoughts. When Tetzel, the broker of the indulgences sent forth by the Pope, sold for money tickets of pardon for past sins, Roman casuistry might plead that the pardon granted by them was merely a remission of ecclesiastical penalties. But when he proposed to furnish for a graduated scale of prices tickets which should absolve offenders for any sins they might in future commit, his traffic presented itself to Luther in the shame of its full enormity. We disclaim utterly any analogy here with anything in the legal theory. We adduce the instance merely to define this one objection, that sins which are virtually forgiven before they are committed must lose something of their dread for the conscience, while repentance for them is divested of something of its imperative necessity as the operative condition of pardon.

We have but a word to utter in conclusion bearing upon the relation between the governmental theory of Atonement and the uses of piety. No word of ours shall question the testimony of the believers of that theory, as confessing to its power over their own hearts. Into the sanctuaries of human breasts we will not intrude, certainly not as disputants. We challenge an oft-repeated assertion simply as it indicates an attempt to monopolize a disciple's love and reverence and gratitude to Christ, and to insist that the grace of his reconciliation shall flow to the human heart only in one channel. It is claimed that the Orthodox view of the Atonement is pre-eminently, almost exclusively, favorable to true Christian piety; that from contemplating Christ as such a sacrifice for such an intent, and as making by such a method our peace with God, the heart is most profoundly penetrated with horror for sin, with a sense of the need, the cost, and the value of redemption, and that the fervor and glow and gratitude of that heart are thus most effectually kindled toward the Saviour. Be it so

to all who can thus testify. They cannot love Christ too much, whatever be their view of the grounds or method of that love. What he has done for us admits of no measurement, and it is for what he has done that he claims the full tribute of our hearts. But may we suggest, not from theory, but from the recorded experience of Christians of various communions, that Christian hearts have chosen different central truths, different symbols of piety, different images and objects out of the rich treasures of devotion to set before them in their various shrines and oratories? The Roman Catholic exalts beyond all other sacred and fond objects in his heart, the Virgin Mary. Her graces and sorrows, her sword-pierced breast, her motherly office for God, her queenly prerogative in heaven, and the prevalence of her intercession, have made her to millions of professed Christians the fountain of their piety, the altar of their worship, the sweet assurance of all their faith. The most acute dialectics of the most skilful apologists of Romanism cannot make clear to the least prejudiced of Protestants how "devotion to Mary" differs from what the Christian owes to God. Again, the mystic pietist finds the central theme of his devotion, and the fullest nourishment for his spiritual affections, in the "Divine Love." His highest moods of peace and joy and faith are ministered to when he yields himself to the fruition of the sentiment to which he gives expression in those words of unfathomed meaning. Other types of Christian piety, comprehending larger or smaller numbers of affiliated souls, engage the inner choice of classes of Christian disciples, according to the delicacy, the culture, the depth, the intelligence, or the refinement of their whole being. It is unwise and unsafe to attempt to concentrate the whole motive energy of piety upon any one truth or element of a universal religion. Each grateful heart is free to express its own experience, and to indicate the point of view in which the Gospel scheme gathers for itself the brightest beams of all the light that it reflects from heaven. But beyond this expression of personal experience, we question the right of any heart to give rules for the method of spiritual radiation to other hearts. And especially would we object to any theory which makes a formula upon the method of rec-

onciliation through Christ to monopolize or to exhaust the compass of the Gospel influence over the various sympathies and exercises of human hearts.

And now we have to confront the conclusion to which our long, and we fear wearisome, debate has brought us. Orthodoxy, not willing to allow each believer to interpret to his own mind and heart the Scripture method of the efficacy of Christ's reconciling work, insists that its own constructive view expressed in its doctrinal formula must be accepted as the condition of acknowledged Christian discipleship. Because we reject this constructive view, we are pronounced to be outside of the pale of Evangelical communion. We regret the decision. We regret it on account of the Orthodox themselves, for it compels us to qualify our respect and affection for them, seeing that they usurp a right which their Master and ours never gave them, and seeing that they prove faithless to their own Protestant principles. We regret the decision on our own account, for we should love to share the sympathies, and to participate in the labors and hopes and noble enterprises of those whom we still regard as brethren in Christ. We regret the decision, but we will not mourn over it. It has no ecclesiastical penalties to visit upon us for which we care one straw. It has now no inquisition, no ballot-box even, to turn its dogmatic test into a torment or an annoyance. It cannot deprive us of Christian fellowship, for whatever we may say of numbers, we have a fellowship of our own, of men and women, who, while they consent to reject in every shape and form the dogma of a God-ward efficacy in the living or the dying work of Christ, accord in a better and a more tender view of the great Redemption, as devised by the love of God, and perfected by the love of Christ. We too love him because he laid down his life for us.

G. E. E.

ART. IV.—THE TWO TEMPLES.

ON the banks of the Rhine river,
In the far-off German land,
A temple, with the time-frost hoary,
Scarred and worn by age, doth stand.
Faith built it in the ages dark,
When faithful work was prayer,
As an offering and an anthem
To the God of Everywhere.

For the rearing there were given
Wealth of noble, vassal's mite, —
Costly gifts of weeping Magdalene,
And of Saintship's heavenly light.
Iron from the deep, dark underground,
And the treasures of the wood, —
Granite from the purple Rhine hills,
Borne adown its restless flood.

Rich in vestments for its altars,
And the dust of kingly dead ;
Paintings rare of ancient masters,
Jewelled Cross of Christ, the Head :
Built up by holy Sacrament,
Of Strength, and Trust, and Prayer,
By the lifting of the spirit
To the Son of Mary fair.

And still the workman laboreth
On this temple high and hoar ;
Still uprising, though unfinished,
As a gift for evermore.
Waiting, in its age and grandeur,
For the Present now to build
What the Past with speechless longing
Left a promise unfulfilled.

Listening underneath its shadows
When the city's din is still,
And the moonlight and the starlight
Lie on river, rock, and hill ;
As a message high and holy,
Sent from dearest ones afar,
Of the kinship and the brotherhood
That linketh star to star, —

With the rush of the Rhine waters,
And the whispers of the night,
Comes another voice unto me,
With its message pure and bright,
Telling of a Spirit temple,
That by rushing waters stands,
Built up in deepest mystery,
Framed by no human hands,

For whose rearing there were given
Fruits of sea and of the earth,
Harvest of the Past and Present,
Wherein lies the Future's birth:—
The roundness of the ancient hills,
The stretch of the wide plain,
The green lines of the babbling brooks,
The homeless deserts of the Main;

Mild glories of night's mantle gemmed,
And the splendors of the day,
The warmth of suns, the rush of worlds
As they hurry on their way;
Song of the Beautiful earth sings,
The whisperings of the trees,
Voices of Life woke by the Spring,
Grand cadences of seas;

Ancient heritage of the heroic,
And of martyrs, pressing on,
Record high of former worship,
Ringing shouts for victory won;
Visions blest of firm endurance,
For the Holy and the True,
Of the Manlike and the Godlike,
Ever old, and ever new;

Crowns of conquest resting gently
On the brows of Saintship pure,
Staff of strength for pilgrim weary,
Ever helping, ever sure;
Blest boon of costly Motherhood,
The sacred aid of Wife,
Smile of Sister, speech of Brother,
Gift of Children, Light of life.

In this temple, grand and solemn,
Heaven-lighted paintings stand,
Speaking of the high and lowly,
Of another clime and land ;
Of the Now and the Hereafter,
And the meanings they contain ;
Of the strength of the victorious,
Of the fight to be maintained.

And the temple holy standeth
Shadowing o'er the watery way,
And the tides of life sweep by it,
Raging round its stones for aye,
And the Present to me calleth,
Minding me to look and see
How this temple grand was given
As a heritage to me ; —

Speaking words of highest wisdom
Of the building that should be,
Of this temple framed and fashioned
By the God of earth and sea.
Unto me the builder calling,
In the name of the Most High,
To be just and true, and ready
For the labors that are nigh ; —

Building by the plan once given
By the Lord of quick and dead,
The Cross of Christ the Master,
Of the earthly Church the Head ;
Laying the foundations firmly
On the Rock of Ages strong,
Building up a temple surely
Fit for praise, and prayer, and song.

And I hear new voices rising
From sea and earth and sky,
And the Ages, my Life teachers,
Pass with noiseless footsteps by ;
And the meaning of my present
Has clearer to me grown,
The " still, small voice " within me
Saying oft, in sweetest tone : —

The Mysteries and the Meanings,
Voices, Beauty, Light, and Life,
The sorrowing of the Human,
And the fierce, unchanging strife,
Matter's splendor, spirit's majesty,
The Substance of the soul, —
These were given, thou Life builder,
For perfecting of the Whole.

Work for aye upon the building
By no mortal footsteps trod ;
Grander far than Earthly Minster,
"Temple of the living God."

N. H. C.

ART. V. — THE ORIGIN OF ANCIENT NAMES OF COUNTRIES, CITIES, INDIVIDUALS, AND GODS.

WE shall endeavor, in the following article, to show that the proper names of Greece, Italy, Asia Minor, Babylon, Egypt, Phœnicia, and Judæa, more especially the names of places and of the gods, are generally compound words containing within them the names of the sun-gods Ab, Ak, Am, Ar, As, At, El, and On.

In this inquiring age it is time that the composition of names which are associated with the legends or the history of the ancient world should receive proper attention. Before the mission of the Saviour, the more intelligent among the Romans had formed the opinion that the various "great gods" of the nations had much in common, notwithstanding the different attributes ascribed to them and the difference of their names. Hercules, Osiris, Janus, Zeus, Jupiter, and many more, were regarded as the same deity, allowing for the difference of ideas which must be expected to exist among different nations on the same subject.

It has been said that Roman polytheism has but two "great gods," Heaven and Earth, — Cœlum and Terra. In the fourth century, Ausonius treats prominent gods of several nations as the same deity under different names : —

“Ogygia me Bacchum vocat ;
 Osirin Ægyptus putat ;
 Mysi Phanacem nominant ;
 Dionyson Indi existimant ;
 Romana Sacra Liberum,
 Arabica Gens Adoneum.”

“Ogygia calls me Bacchus ;
 Egypt thinks me Osiris ;
 The Mysians name me Phanax ;
 The Indi consider me Dionysus ;
 The Roman Sacra call me Liber ;
 The Arabian race, Adonis.”

The Rhodian oracle declares Atys or Attis to be Adon-is, Bacch-us, and Dionusus :—

“Magnum Atten placate Deum qui castus Adonis
 Evius est, Largitor opum, pulcher Dionysus.”

Not only is there a coincidence in the general idea which the ancients had of the deities, but often there is a very great verbal resemblance in their names. They are frequently exactly the same word.

The appellations of the gods are generally translated or explained by words of the same sound in the language of the country where the name belongs. For instance, the word *Salii*, the priests of Hercules, and of Mars in Italy, is usually derived from *salio*, “to leap”: we prefer to derive it from Sol or Ausel, the sun, and compare it with the *Selli* mentioned in Homer, priests of Jup-iter, who were also called Ἑλλοί (*Helloi*), from El or Asel, the sun ; ἑλη, ἔλη (*Hele*), alea or halea (*ἄλεα*), and halo (in English), mean the same. We have the Etruscan *Usil*, and *Ausel*, names of the sun.

Aphrodite, the Grecian name of Venus, is supposed to be formed from ἀφρός, “the foam of the sea.” We think it a compound of Abar, the sun, the shining Bar of the Assyrian inscriptions, and Adad (pronounced Atad or Adat), the sun ; like Adittha, the name of an ancient city on the Euphrates, and Adit-ya, the Sanskrit name of the spirits of light.

As a younger race, the Greeks would naturally borrow many ideas from the more advanced nations of Asia Minor, Palestine, Phœnicia, Egypt, and Mesopotamia ; just as we are indebted to Europe for the large

proportion of the books read by us. Were their deities entirely the creation of the Hellenic mind? Was *Adon-is*, the beloved of Venus, originally a Grecian deity, or is he of Assyrian origin? Movers, in his account of the Phœnicians,* says that the *first* syllable of *Sar-dan-apalus*, the Assyrian king and deity-name, is the word *Asar*, *Azar*, or *Asur*, a name of the Assyrian Mars. The *second* syllable, "dan," is *Adān*, which is again found in *Asar-adon*, or *Esar-haddon*, a king's name, and is plainly אָדָן (*Adan*) without the A. It is אָדָן, the Carthaginian *Don*; and is very common in Assyrian names, like *Merodach-Baal-adan*, *Nabu-zar-adan*, the captain of the guard, mentioned in the Bible.

To these words, instanced by Movers, we may add the names of *Bel-Adon(im)-sha*, ruler at Khorsabad, *Neb-uch-adon-ossar* or *Neb-uch-ad.n-ezzar*, *Abi-dan* or *Phaethon*, *San-dan*, the Assyrian Mars, *Tana-is* or *Athena* (*Minerva*); *Dan*, *Tina*, *Jupiter-Tinia*, *Dan-iel*, *-Oth.n-iel*, *-N-athan-iel*, *-N-athan*, *Jon-athan*, *Adonai*, *Adoni-bezek*, *Adoni-ram*, *Adoni-kam*, *Adoni-jah*, *-Dona-paris* or *-Dni-eper*, *Αδων*, *Ari-ad.ne*, and *Udine*, a place in Italy.

Adon-(is) is the sun. He was said to pass six months with Venus and six months with Proserpine. "Adon-is or Adonai was an Oriental title of the sun."† In the Bible, we have "the children of Eden which were in Thelasar,"‡ and the garden of Adan (Eden) in Genesis. Other forms of Adan (*Adonis*, the sun-god) are *Ham-adan*, the capital of Media, *Tina*, the name of Jupiter in Italy, *Tina*, the name of a place in Arabia, *Atten* (as *Adon-is* is called by the Rhodian oracle), and *Posidon*, the name of *Nep-tune* (*Nep* is the Assyrian *Nebo*, Mercury; *-tune* is *Adan*, the Mesopotamian sun-god). In the North of Europe, *Adan* is *Odin*, the Scandinavian king and god. We have the Bible-names *Adin* and *Adino*, the names of persons, *M-idian*, of a country, *Diana*, a goddess of Italy, *M-ethone*, an ancient city, called also *M-odon*. We have the river *Don*, in Russia, the *Ther-m-odon*, which empties into the Black Sea, not very far from Trebizond, and the *Udon*, which flows

* Page 479.

† R. P. Knight. See Anthon's Class. Dict., Art. Adonis.

‡ 2 Kings xix. 12.

into the Caspian Sea. There is the river *Jor-dan* in Palestine, the *Jar-dan*, a river in Greece, another river of the same name in the island of Crete, and a hero, *Jar-dan-es*. Jar is the fire-god Ar, a part of the word *Jer-usalem*, the ancient Salem (compare the Bible-name *Jehova-Shalom*, also *Ab-salom*, and *Salomi*).

The Greek *Hermes* or *Hermeias* (*Mercury*) is said to be the Median word *Sarameyas*, "who leads the souls to Hades" (*h* being the softened form of *s*). It is evident that the Greeks took the names *Adan* (*Adonis*) and *Hermeias* (*Mercury*) wholly from "the East." But an attentive examination of the composition of proper names — *Nebuchadonossar*, *Nebo* (*Mercury*), *Achad* (the sun), *Adan* (*Adon-is*), *Ossar* (*Oseir-is*); *Nabocolassar*, *Nabo* (*Mercury*), *Ac* (the fire-sun), *El* (the sun), *Asar* (*Mars*), the sun-god; *Nabopolassar*, *Nabo* (*Mercury*), *Apol* (*Apollo*), *Assar* (*Mars*) — suggests the idea that many of the names of the ancient world will be found to be made up of *other names* of one and two syllables. They may finally be reduced to eight *names of sun-gods* of one syllable each, which, variously compounded together, make up the names of gods, kings, rivers, countries, and cities. They are *Ab*, *Ak*, *Am*, *Ar*, *As*, *At* (*Ad*), *El*, and *On* (*Ani*).

Ab, *Ap*, or *Op* is an old name of the sun in Italy. In Egypt it is *Api*, *Hapi*, and *Ap-is* (*Phi-os*, an Egyptian king). In Babylon and Persia it is *Ab* or *Av*. We find *Sal-ap-ia*, a city of *Ap-ul-ia* in Italy (*Sol-Ap*), *Zal-aph*, a Bible-name, *Sal-ap-eni*, a people of Arabia, *Ap-ia*, Greece, the land of *Ap*, the sun; *Iap-ygia*, a name of *Magna Græcia* in Italy, "Auf," an Arab divinity, *Joab*, a Hebrew captain, and *Job*; also *Jub-al* and *Jab-al*, names of old Hebrew deities or patriarchs. Compare *Abi-el*, *Ab-el* (*Ap-ollo*), and Ἀπ-ελλ-ων, "the fighter."

Ani, a name of the sun in Assyria, is in Egypt and Syria *On*. In Greece it is *Jan* and *Ion*. In Italy it is *Jan-us* (*Ean-us*), whom Scaliger has shown to be the god of the sun.* In Etruria it is *Jonn*.

El, or *Eli*, the sun, is found in Greece, Mesopotamia, Phœnicia, and Judæa. It is the name of the chief deity of the Semitic races. It is ἥλι-ος the sun; in Homer,

* Niebuhr's *Rome*, Am. ed., p. 62.

Eeli-os and Aeli-os. In the New Testament it is Eli! Eli! In Job and Isaiah it is El. In Genesis it is El, El-jon, El-Sadai, Elohim, and Hael-ohim (compare Asel, Ausel, or Usil, the sun). Among the Turks it is Al, or Allah. It is also Il, Joel, Jael, Jul-ia, and Iul-ius.

Az, As (or Ah), is another name of the sun. It is found in Assyria and other countries generally. It changes to Os and Oh, Ush and Uz. The Greek form is Ias, and Υἱς. As-as was an Arabian god, and As-is a sun-deity at Edessa. Is-is was the Egyptian sun-goddess. We have Asa, king of Judah, the Asi, a people of As-ia; Aus and Auza, names of Arab tribes, and Uzza, an Arabian divinity, Al-uzza.

Ad, or At, is Atys and Attis, Ad-ad, the sun (Adad), the river Adda, the Bible-name Ada, Aud, or Ad, a deity of Arabia, and Ath-os, the mount of At. Ad is also the name of an Arab tribe, is part of Jehoi-iada, a Jewish king, Eli-ada, a Bible-name, and Ioud-aia, or Jud-æa. It is the name of the altar called "Ed" by the children of G-ad (the sun, Achad), Otho-es, king of Egypt, and Otho, the Roman Emperor. Adi, with the termination of the nominative, is Di-os, De-us, and Θε-ος.

Ar, or Ari, meaning fire-sun, is in Greek Ar-es, in Phœnicia and Judæa it is Ar, "the fire" (Iar); it is "Ur," or Aur, "of the Chaldees," the seat of the fire-priests. It is the Latin Ur-o, "to burn," Ar-ia, a country, Ar-eioi, the Medes, who were fire-worshippers. It is the fire-god Ari-el, אֲרִי־אֵל (Ariel), a name of Jer-usalem, and אֵל-אֲרִי, Al-or-us, the Babylonian God of light. It is derived from אֵר, אֲדִי, אֲרִי, meaning Fire, and is connected with Ara, a fire-altar, Uri-el, a Bible-name, Ari-och, a king, and Ar-ioch, a captain of the king's guard in Babylon.

Ak is Jacch-os, a name of B-acch-us, or Ev-ecch-ius (another name of Bacchus). We find Ach-eans, the people, and Ach-aia, the land of Ak; also Ach-es, an Egyptian king, Acca, a port in the Levant, B-ak-tria, a country, Bal-ak, a prince in the Bible, Pel-eg, a patriarch in Genesis, Og, king of Bashan, Og-yg-es, the sun-god of the flood-legend, Ag-ag, king of the Amalekites, and Yauk, an Arabian deity,* Och-us and Bel-och-us, kings

* Universal Hist., Vol. XVIII. p. 384.

of Babylon, *Ak-mon*, a fire-god, *Ar-ioch*, a king, and *Eac-us*, an infernal deity.

Am is *am* (in Hebrew *jom*, meaning "day"), in the Dorian language it is *ἄμαρ* ('amar), in the Attic Greek it is *ἡμε-ερα*, "a day"; it is the Phœnician deity *M-ar* or *Om-ar*, it is the Hindu god *Jama*, the Persian *Jima*. It is found in *Ammi* and *Ami*, the names of persons in the Bible, in *Bal-aam*, the priest-king in Genesis ("and *aBel-aam* said unto *aBel-ak*"). *Mir-iam* is *Omar*, and *Am* or *Iom*. The *Em-im*, a people mentioned in the Bible (plural of *Em*), is this same word *Am*. We find also *Ima* and *Jouma*, Syrian names of places, and *Aoym-is* (*Aoum*), the sun, "the first-born." The feminine of *Am* is properly *Maia*, the earth, the daughter of *Atlas*, the sun (*Sol-Talaios*).

It is compounded with *On* or *Ani*, the sun, in the words *Am-an-us* and *Om-an-us*, names of "a deity worshipped in Pontus and Cappadocia, whom Bochart identifies with the sun."*

Am makes a part of *Amos*, *Moses*, *Am-asis*, and *Am-men-em-es*, two kings of Egypt, *Am-on*, the *Amun-Ra* of Egypt, the Jupiter *Ammon* of Lybia; and is found in *Im-manu-el* (*Imm-annu-el* = *Ammon-El*), *Ani-am*, *Abi-jam*, *B.en-iam-in*, and *Jam-in*, Hebrew names, in *Yam-an* (or *Yemen* in Arabia), in *Ar-yam-an*, a Hindu sun-god, *H-am-adan*, the capital of *M-ed-ia* (*Am-adi-a*), and *Iam-en-us*, a name in Homer; also in the Bible-names *Jam-l-ech* (which is *Am-al-ak*, *Moloch*, or *Mel-ech*), *Ador-am* (*Am* the sun-god and *Adar* the fire-god), *H-ir-am*, *Jeh-or-am* (*Asur*, or *Ahura*, and *Am*; compare *Haram-eias* and *Sar-ameyas* or *Hermes*, *Mercury*, *Sar-ama*, the Hindu goddess, and *Sur-m-ubel*, the serpent deity of the Phœnicians, the beneficent *Ophion-Cad-mus*). We have also *M.on-im-us*, the associate deity (paredros) of the *Ed-essa* sun-god, the god *M-al-ch-am*, or *Mil-com*, *Baal-chom* (or *Apollo Chom-aeus*), *Ach-aem-en-es*, *Akambusi-ya* (*aC-am-byses*), *Bushi-cham*, and *C-am-us*, the god.

The sun-name *Ad* is found in the reduplicated form *Ad-ad*, or *Tat* (*Tot*, *Taut*). Compounded with *El* (the sun) we have the Bible-names *Eli-dad* and *El-dad*; with

* Kuhn's Zeitschrift for 1853, p. 183.

Ab we have B-il-dad, with Am, Medad. Adad compounded with Ani (the sun) gives T-it-an, a name of the sun, Teut-ones, the Germans, the Dut-ch (from Teut, the sun, and On, the sun), and T-ith-on-us, the spouse of Aurora: also Dod-ona, famous for its oracle, and Ded-an, a patriarch.* Other forms of Adad (or Ad) are Athoth-is, an Egyptian king, the god Thoth (Taut or Tat), Thoth-m-es, the king, Tiota, the Celtic word meaning "sun," Titho-es, an Egyptian word meaning light, Titha, the Sanskrit word for fire, Adittha, a name of a city, and Titus, a man's name. Prefixing the sun-name As, or Ah, we have H-adad, a Syrian name of the sun; As and Ad united give S-aad, an Arabian deity, El-Sadai, of the Bible, Asad, the Arabian Mercury (the sun-god),† Sadi, the Persian poet, and H-eth, the name of a Hebrew; Aseth and S-ait-es, kings of Egypt; Seth, the son of Adam.

Ad compounded with "Am" gives Ed-om, the name of a country and a people. אִשׁוֹ אֶבְיִ אֶדוֹם, Asav (or Esau), father of Edom. Edom is Adam.‡ We have Et-am, a village, Et-am, a rock,§ Joth-am, a Hebrew king, Eth-am, "on the edge of the wilderness," Tham-ud, an Arab tribe, Tham-udeni (Adonis), a people of Arabia, Adama, an Arabian city, Adami, a place mentioned in the Bible. In Egypt At-mu is the sun, and Tamie, the moon. In Greece Ar-temis is the moon, the chaste Diana; Teut-am-us (Ad+Adam) was an Assyrian king at the time of the Trojan war.

Apollo (the sun-god, the "far-darter") tends the cows (the figurative expression for sunbeams||) of Ad-m-etus. Thamm-uz is the name of Adon-is, the sun. We have Baal-Tam-ar, a name of Baal, Tam-ar, a daughter of David, Obed-Edom (Adam) the Gittite, Dem-od-oc-us, a poet mentioned in Homer, Dem-ar-us (another Noah perhaps), Dem-eter (Adam+Adar), who is "Eve, mother of all living";¶ Tem-eni (Adam and Ani, the sun) and Tem-an are Bible-names. Tem-en-bar is an Assyrian deity, and Bar-tim-eus (Tamie the moon, Ar-itim-is = Diana), who sat at the gates of Jer-icho, is named from the sun-gods Abar and Adam. We have also the

* Genesis, chap. x.

† Universal History, Vol. XVIII. pp. 379, 387.

‡ Universal History, Vol. II. p. 453.

§ Judges xv. 11.

|| And the waters of heaven.

¶ Genesis iii. 20.

names *Dam-on* and *Tim-on*, *Dam-ar-is*, a woman,* and *Timo-theus*.

Whatever was the origin of these eight monosyllabic names of the sun, they are found from Italy to Egypt, Mesopotamia, and Bactria.

It is necessary, before going further, to premise that the ancients interchanged the vowels to a great extent. In modern books, each vowel is preserved in all its purity; it is fixed for ever by the printed character. But at a period when manuscripts were not yet common, there was a laxity in the use of vowels and consonants, sufficient partly to obscure, in many cases, the external signs of the origin of words. The vowels were not always inserted. A consonant was thought, from the nature of the case, to contain a vowel appended to it. T was Ta, B was Ba, K, Ka, as in Sanskrit. The first alphabets were syllables, not letters.

In Hebrew the vowel-points were not used until long after Christ; and the old language was written with the aid of a few vowels, which were not generally expressed. Jehova-Elohim was written *ihoa elhim*; Jonathan, *oiaonthn*; Jerusalem, *iroslm*; David, *dvd*; Ahitophel, *oahitpl*. As, therefore, vowels were often left in charge of the memory, it is not strange that, as in the vulgarisms and provincialisms of modern times, they should have run into one another. The broad *a* is *o* and *au*; the short *a* is also a short *i*, and frequently is dropped; as, *Pidaura*, anciently *Epidaur-us*, *Sarak* for *Asarac*, *Mardi* for *Amardi*, a people of Asia, *Media* for *Amadia*. Very often *a* is misread *e* in the Bible; for Aleph, the first character of the Hebrew alphabet, is both *a* and *e*. The consonants were continually transmuted into their middle and aspirated forms. P is B and Ph. T becomes D and Th, as in *Methone* and *Modon*, two names of the same city. K passes over into G and Ch. I is continually prefixed to words beginning with a vowel, and is often added at the end. S softens to Sh and H.

But, to resume the consideration of the eight names of sun-gods, which, compounded together, make up most of the proper names of antiquity. They are Ab, Ak, Am, Ar, El, As, At, On.

* Acts xvii. 34.

Ani (the sun) is On, Jan, in Greece, the Etruscan Jonn, Jan-us, an ancient king of Italy, the river Anio, Jaanai, a Bible-name, Jan-us, with two faces, the Roman war-god, his name Ean-us, and Eani, a people. From Ani comes, *with the light of the sun, Ani-mation* (*Ani-matio*), *Ani-ma*, "the soul, the life," and *Ani-mare*, the verb "to *ani-mate*." It is the last syllable of Dag-ōn, the sun-god with the extremity of a fish, and Odacon, "the man-fish" of the Babylonian legend. We may compare with the syllables of Dag-ōn the German Tag,* meaning "day," the Etruscan Tag-es, and the Babylonian Oann-es (Ani, the sun-god), who rose from the sea to instruct the people in the arts of life.

Ani is thus mentioned by Rawlinson:—

"In the northwest palace of Nimroud there is an inscription of Sar-dan-apal-us repeated more than a hundred times: 'This is the palace of Sardanapalus, the humble worshipper of Assarac and Beltis, of the shining Bar, of Ani, and of Dagon, who are the principal of the gods.' An obelisk inscription also runs as follows: 'Asarac, the great lord, king of all the great gods; Ani, the king; Nit, the powerful, and Artenk, the supreme god of the provinces, Beltis, the protector, mother of the gods.' . . . Shemir who presides over the heavens and the earth. . . . Bar. . . . Artenk, Lama, Horus. . . . Tal and Set, the attendants of Beltis, mother of the gods." †

Three places named Ani are laid down on the maps; one north of Lake Wan, the other west of it, a little to the northwest of Pallu. ‡ Another at the source of the river Ri-oni, near the Caucasus. It is also the name of the city On, or Heliopolis, the city of the sun, now Baal-bee, and the name of the Egyptian On, whose priest was Pot-iphaz, or Potipheres, compounded of the gods Phut and Phre, the sun (Phut and Bar, or Abar, Pars or Perseus, the sun, the Egyptian Phre). We find also a city Auna on the Euphrates, Unna, a river of European Turkey, and Onn-os, a king of Egypt.

Ani has in Sanskrit the form Ina (the sun), in Greece, Egypt, and Palestine it is On, ion, aon, anō, iun, oni, one, Ono, No, and Unni. Elon, the highest god in Phœnicia, is a compound of El, the sun, and On (Ani).

* Deuk-alion, Ithaca, the isle, Attica, the land, and Tagus, the river, of the sun.

† Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, Vol. XII. pp. 427, 432.

‡ Spruner's Ancient Atlas.

In San-chon-iathon's account of Phœnician deities, it has the form Elioun or Elion. In the Old Testament we find El Eljon, the god of whom Melchizedek was priest, the "most high" God by whom Abraham swears.* Another form in Hebrew is Ailon, אֵילֹן, the name of a person, and Elon, the head of the Elon-ites.

In the inscription on the coffin of Esmun-azar, which was recently discovered at Sidon, the occupant of the sarcophagus says he has "built a temple to *Elon* of the Sidonians in Sidon, in the land on the sea, a temple to Baal and Astarte."† The name Elon is, in Greece, the name of a person.

Ani is Aïōn (Αἰών), the sun, "the first-born," in the Phœnician and Chaldean learning; Homer's αἰών, a word meaning "life," and the Eon of the Gnostic religions.

Compounds of Ani, or Ina, and Adar are In.dr.a, god of the sky in India, the An.dr.a of the Persians, En-dor, the abode of the witch, and (with Ap, the sun, prefixed) Pan-dar-us and P-in.dar, the poet.

Adar is Adar-melech, the fire-god, Oder, a river in Prussia, Odra, a river in European Turkey, Dor, in the name of the Dor-ians, named after their god, as the Israelites from Asar-el (Israel), Dar-ius, the sun-name of the Persian king. We also find H-athor, the Egyptian goddess, and Athyr, a month; Adr-iel, Jetur (Adar), and Jattir, a place, Bible-names. Adriel is Adar-El, the fiery El, or Ari-el, of Judæa (the land of Ad, or "Adi-el," a Bible-name). Compare Del-os, the island, and Sol-Talaios, a deity worshipped in Crete. Adel, or Tal, is the Assyrian name of the sun-god, the Delian Apollo. Jetur or Jethr-o, is Atar or Adar. We have Dar, the name of an Arab tribe, Tur, Tyre, and Turan, a country of Asia. It is the "Athur" in Athuria, a name of Assyria. Adar was merely another name of Asur, Assur, Asar, and Asarac, the chief god. The Chaldee Targums give Athor for the Hebrew Asur.‡ The Turks call Tyre (from Atur) Sour (another name of the same god). Mithra, the Persian and Hindu deity, is Am-adar. We have M-adra, a Hindu people, M.ad.aura, an African city, M-etaur-us, a river in Italy, Mithridat-es (Mithra

* Genesis xiv. 18, 22.

† Dietrich's Translation.

‡ Rawlinson, Royal Asiatic Soc. Journal, Vol. XI. Part I. p. 10.

and Adad, the sun), the Hindu king Datt-amithra (Adad + Mithra), D-em-etri-us (Ad the sun, and Mithra, or Adam, and Adar), the Greek name of the same king, and the Bible-name Ador-am.

Countries were named after the gods there worshipped, cities likewise. "Assyria was thus certainly named after Assarac, Asarak, or Asarah."* He is considered N-isroch (Ani, the sun, and As-ar-ac), the Assyrian god in whose temple Sennacherib was slain. We may compare Ser-ug in the Bible, Es-r-ak, a place in Arabia, and Sar-gon, the king name, which is N-isroch, with the "N" or "An" at the end of the word; also Sor-acte, a mountain (Asar and Achad, the sun), Achat-es, the friend of Æneas, Ach-th-oes, king of Egypt, (Ach-tho,) and Ac-d-est-is (Achad and Asad, Sadai or Set, the sun).

As with Ar gives Asar, the god, Ez-er, the name of a person,† Ezra, the scribe, Azar, the fire-god (As, Asur, or Assar and Asar-ac, the deity after whom Assyr-ia is named, and whose name "As" is the name of the whole continent of As-ia. See the Bible-name Asi-el). We have Zohar, the fire-god, and Zar-etis, his goddess, M-el-zar, B-el-shazzar, and Bel-t-esh-azzar. Asur is called Asura, with the epithet "Mazda," the wise (*s* becomes the softened *sh*, and is *h*). Asura is Ahura-Mazda (called Aura-masta, from Aur, "the fire"). In India the sun's name is Sur-ya, and the term Asura is found applied to evil deities. It is probable that they were the old sun-deities, like the twelve Titans (from Ad-ad, the sun, and On, the sun). So the Turks call Tyre (from Adar, the sun or fire-god), Sour (the sun, Asur). The Latin name was Sarra (Asar). Bible-names containing the deity-name Azar, are Azar-iah, Isr-ael, a Phœnician name of Saturn, Asr-iel,‡ Ele-azar, Azr-iel, El-izur, son of Sh-edaur ("As," the sun, and Adar, the fire-god), and Osor-thon, the Egyptian king (Asar-adan).

We have Isar, a tributary of the Danube in Bavaria, Oseir-is (who is Asar), Seir, a name of a mountain, Ashur, in the Bible, Sair, an Arabian god worshipped by the tribe Auza,§ the Hebrew tribe Asher, Auzara, the

* Rawlinson, Asiatic Society, Vol. XII. p. 424.

† Nehemiah, chap. iii.

‡ Joshua xvii.

§ Universal History, Vol. XVIII. p. 387.

name of a city on the Euphrates, and Ahira, a Bible-name of a person ([A]siris, Osiris, Asura or Ahura).

Baal had his altars in Isr-ael with Ashera, his goddess (Azara or Asara). We are inclined to derive Sardinia also from Asar and Tinia (Jupiter-Tinia), Tina or Adan.

Ab, compounded with Ak (the fire-god), gives B-acch-us, the god, Pekah, a Jewish king, Aphek, a Bible-name, R-aphak-es, an Egyptian, Re-bek-ah (Re, the sun, and Bekah, Bacchus), Ev-ech-ius, the name of Bacchus (*v* is *b*). We have Atar-bech-is (Venus) and Baal-bech (Heliopolis). Bacchus is also called Evi-us (Abi). In the Bible we have Evi, the name of a person, and L-*evi* (Levi), the same as Eli-ab, a compound of El and Ab, or Ev. Bacch-us is the old Persian sun-god Baga. Among the Slavonians he is "Bog, the rising sun." The river Bug has his name. On the banks of the Indus he is Bhaga the Adit-ya. Other forms of the name are Bukki and Pagi-el, names of persons in the Bible, Bago-as, Boch-us, Bocch-or-is, and Evag-or-as, Egyptian kings.

V-*ivagh*.ao, a name of the sun in ancient Persia, is probably Ab-aB-ag, the doubled form, like P-aP-a-ios, the Scythian form of Ap, the sun, and Adad, the reduplication of Ad, the sun. Ab-ib is the name of a Jewish month. Several Jewish months are named after deities. Ep-aph-us is the Egyptian name of the same month. We find also the kings Ep-iph-an-es, Aphob-is, and the Egyptian king's name Ap-op-is, the Bible-names Bavai, Bebai, H-ob-ab, the son of R-ag-uel,* and Ab-ib-al, a Phœnician king.

Ab, compounded with El, gives the god Bil or Bel, Abel, Ab-il-ah, a city, Evil (as in Evil-Merodach, king of Babylon). B softens continually into V. Pars (Persia) becomes Fars, the Abarti, Afarti, Sebastopol is Sevastopol, Elisabethpol is Elisawethpol, south of the Caucasus mountains. Seb and Sev are Egyptian names of Saturn. Phil-ist-ia, the country of the Philistines, is Abel-Seth, or Set. With these names we may compare Sab-us, a Phœnician god, Usov, the Phœnician Mars, Suph-is, king of Egypt, Asaph, in the Bible, Asav (Sat-

* Numbers x.

urn), Esau, and the name of the poetess Sappho. They are probably all compounded of two names of the sun-god, As and Ap. We find the Bible-names Eli-asaph, Ioseph, Ios-ib-iah, Ios-iph-iah, Zeph-an-iah, and Zeb-ulon (Seb-Elon, the Saturn-Elion, or "El Eljon" of Abraham and Melchizedek; as the name of a person in the Bible it is Eli-enai and Elih-o-enai), Zif, a Hebrew month-name, Seba, the Arabian god of heaven, Zab-ii (the Sab-aeans), Zob-al (or As-Abel), a name of Saturn. H-ob-al, the chief of three hundred and sixty Arabian idols.* Compare the Sabellians, a people, and Savelios (the sun, Gothic Sauil, Sol in Latin, Ausil, Usil, the Auselii, a family). Jehova is called Seb-a-oth, "God of hosts," or God of heaven; "Him whom heavenly hosts obey." Savitar, the creator-sun of the Hindus, is Sab, or Sev (Saturn), and -itar, Atar, the fire and sun-god. The Bible gives the queen of Sheb-a (or S'eb-a), which is Seb-Saturn, Ish-bak, a man's name, and we have S-ab-acho, Seb-ich-os, or Sev-ech-us, king of Egypt.

If the fire-god Ak is compounded with Ani, the sun, we have the name of Saturn, Chon (Kewan), Baal-chon, Chiun, worshipped in Egypt by the Israelites, Sar-gon (an Assyrian king = Asar-Chon), Con-iah and Jecon-iah, Bible-names, Chaon, who is Chon, the deity Ken in Assyria, Can-op-us and Kn-eph, Egyptian names of gods, Kanoon, the Syrian month-name, and Can-aan, a Phœnician deity, (the *land* of Canaan,) mentioned in San-chon-iath-on. We have also S-an-c-us, the Sabine word for "heaven," In-ach-us, the sun, the Phrygian Ann-ak-os; An-ouke, the Egyptian goddess of the earth, the Bible-names En-och, An-ak,† the Ann-akim, N.ek-oda, a Bible-name, N-ach.or, a place (compare Achor, the name of a valley, and Kur, the sun), N.echo (Pharao), and N.eck.eb.‡

The Median Hindus ascribed their book of "the law" to Manu (or Menu). The laws of Manu were the gift of the "all-knowing sun," the chief god Man-es, Oman-us, or Mon-imus (in Germany, Mannus, in Crete, Minos, in Egypt, Menes, in Arabia, the god Manah, *h* being *s*). Amanus and Omanus are identified with the sun by Bochart. We have Manu, the Hindu Noah of

* Universal History, Vol. XVIII. p. 386.

† Joshua xiv.

‡ Joshua xix. 33.

the flood (Nuh of the waters, the Egyptian god of the annual overflow), Amun, the Egyptian name of the sun-god, and Aman-us, part of the Taur-us range of mountains; Haman-im, the sun-images in Babylon. Baal is Saman and Haman. He is represented with four faces looking to the four quarters of the heavens. Haman is a man's name, in the book of Esther; Haman "the son of Hamm-edatha" (Adad, the sun, and Ham or Sam, the sun). Other forms of Am, the sun, are the pool of Silo-*am* (Sol and Am), *Am-asis*, an Egyptian king (Am, and Asis, the sun), *Am-aziah*, king of Judah, *Am-aza*, a name of Diana, *N-aomi*, *Jer-om-baal*, and *Abi-jam*.

The old Italian sun-god Ap, Op (or Ab), is the bull Ap-is of the Egyptians, the steer Ab-*udad* (*Adad*, the sun) of the Persians, the Egyptian name of Amen-oph, or Amun-oph, the Arabian "Al-Auf," the god Auf, Ab-ed or Eb-ed of the Bible (*Ebed-ezer*), Evi, the name of a Hebrew, the cities Ava and Nin-eva (*An-an-ias*, *H-an-ani*, *Onan*), the name Eve of the Bible, *Abi-el*, *Ab-d-iel*, *Abi-ezer*, *Abi-dan*, *Abi-jah*, *Abi-me-lech*, *Abi-athar* (*Adar*, the sun), *Ab-dera*, a Thracian city, *Ep-idaur-us*, now called *Pi-daur-ra* (*Jup-iter* or *Jop-adar* (*Ater*, the sun), the Assyrian *Adar-melech*, the fire-god). It seems more reasonable to connect the name Jupiter with Op, the sun, the old Italian god (*iuve* = *Jovi*), with *Jap-et* and *Jap-et-os*, which Buttman considers names of the Supreme Being, than to adopt the derivation from the Sanskrit *Djaush*, "Heaven," or *Diu* or *Div*, "to shine" (*Divus*), and *Pitar*, "father." *Dius-piter* and *Dies-piter* are less natural than Op, the sun, Our father, (*iOp-piter*), the name of the river Po, or *P-ad-us* (*Jap-et-us*). Compare *As-op-us*, or *As-opo*, a river in Thesaly, and *Ap-us*, a river in Illyricum.

Ab, compounded with the sun-name Ad, forms *Ab-ed-nego*, *Ob-ed-iah*, *Obed-Edom*, and *P-ed-ah-zur*, Bible-names.

Japet (or *Jupit-er*) is the Greek *Puth-ios* (the Pythian Apollo), *Pytho*, the sun-dragon, the Egyptian *Phut* or *Phth-ah*, the fire-god *Ptah* (compare the Titan *Japet-os*, and *Jephth-ah*, judge of Israel), *Phut*, the Hebrew patriarch,* and *Iphitus*.† The "iter" in the name of *Jup-iter*

* Genesis x.

† Odyss. xxi. 26.

is perhaps connected with the Italian names *Adria* (the modern *Atri*), *Etr-uria*, and *Adr-iatic*. We have the Babylonian goddess *Ater-gatis*, called also *Tar-kat* and *Der-keto*; and "the children of *Ater*," in *Nehemiah*.

Japh-et, *Jup-iter* or *Op*, the sun-god, reappear in the name of the river *Auf-id-ius*, in *V.ed-ius*, a name of *Jupiter* (*Ab.ed*, *Ab* or *Auf*, the Arabian god), and in *Ve-adar*, the name of the Jewish intercalary month. (*Ved-ius* would be perhaps *Ve-ad-ius*. The *Ar*, in *Ve-ad-ar*, is the fire-god *Ar* or *Ar-es*, the Assyrian fire-god *Adar-melech* or *Adrammelech*.) We have also *-P-eth-or* (*op-eth-or*), a place mentioned in the Bible, *-P-et-er* (*ap-et-er*), the Apostle, *-S-av-itar* (*As+Jov-itar*, *Sev-Adar*), the Creator-sun of the Hindus, and *-Ph-aed.r-us*, the fabulist.

If we decline *Op* (as *Jup-iter* is declined), we have, Nominative *Op*, *Joppa*, *Job* (the Hebrew), *Jove*, or the Arabian god *Auf*; Genitive, *Iovis*; Dative, *Iovi*.

Jov-is is then the genitive case, not of *Jupiter*, but of *Jop* or *Auf*, the sun (*Ab*, *Ap*, or *Op*). Compare *Baiae* and *Veii*, two names of places in Italy, and *Iiv*, the Oscan deity.

El ("the sun," "God"), compounded with *Ap* (*Ab*), the sun, gives *Apel* (*Apollo*) "the fighter," *Ab-el*, *Bel*, the sun-god of Mesopotamia, Phœnicia, and Palestine; all the *Baal-im* or *Elim*, the sun-gods; and *Apulia*, the land of *Epul*, *Apollo*. Other forms of the name are *Phul*, an Assyrian king, *Pallu*, a Bible-name, *Apelles*, *Phell-es*, *Evil*, a Babylonian name, *Awal*, an Arab divinity, *El-paal*, *Vul-can* or *Balcan* or *Bal-cain* or "Th-ubal-cain, the instructor of every artificer in brass and iron."*

Apel appears in *Pleione*, mother of the nymph *Maia* (*Mai*, the month *May*). *Pleione* is the spouse of *Atlas*, who is *Sol-Tal-aïos* (compare *Tal*, the Assyrian god, and *Thales*, a philosopher), *Ital-ia* (Italy), *Del-os*, the isle, *Atell-a*, an Oscan city, *Attal-us*, king of *Pergamus*, *Atl-as*, the deity, *Tola* and *Tal-mon*, names of Hebrews. *Cain* and *Ab-el* are *Bel*, the sun, and *Chon* (the *Baal-Chon*, or *Agni*, or *Chiun*, or *Chaôn*). We find *Z-abul*, the name of a prince. It is *As-Abel*. The word *Z-ebulon* is *Sab*, *Saturn*, and *Elon*, *Elion*, the most high God. *Bel-zeb-ul* and *Belzebub* are compounded of *Ab*, *El*, and *As*, names of the sun.

* Genesis iv. 22.

Ab and El are seen in the name of Pol-lux (Lux meaning light, Lukē, λυκη (El+Ak), and Pol meaning Apollo). The name Nab-opol-asar contains the name Apollo. Bel-itan, Bal-adan, and Plutōn are names of Bel or Apel (Apollo). His name is Bōl and Bul; also βωλαθην.

Pollio or Paul is apparently another form of these words. We have Bil, a name of Bel, Abil, an Arab tribe, and Bil-dad, a Bible-name, which is Bil, the sun, and Adad, the sun. Apollo and the Bible patriarch Jubal were both skilled in playing the lyre: the patriarch Jabal was as rich in cattle as sun-gods usually are. (Indra, the Hindu god, is "rich in cattle.") Pal-es is the god and goddess of cattle. Apollo, while tending the cattle of Admetus, on the banks of the river Amphrysus, has them stolen from him by Mercury, the Arcadian sun-god. Palmyra (called also Tadmor) is Apel-Omar (the Phœnician deity Mar). Tadmor is Adad, the sun, and Omar. Since Adad and Apel are both sun-names, it is natural that they should be given to the same place. Mercur or Mercury is Omar, the sun, Amar, the day, and Kur, the sun. Phil-emon is Abel-Amon.

El is the sun, As is the sun, Ani is the sun. United, they give L-os-na, a name of the moon in Italy. Putting "As" first, they give S-el-ene, another name of the moon (in Greece); and S-il-enus, the sun-Bacchus (from Ausil or Asel, the sun, and Ani).

El compounded with On, the sun, gives Luna, the moon, and El-on, the chief deity (sun-god) of the Phœnicians, and of Jerusalem, the ancient Salem. We have Jehova-Shalom, Solom-on, Shelumi-el, Shelom-ith, Baal-Shal-isha (Baal-Sol-Ishi, or Jah), the Bible-names Ish-iaho, Ab-ishai, and Esh-baal; and in Hosea ii. 16, "Thou shalt call me Ishi, and no more Beali" (As, or Ashi, softened, Iah or Iahi, the Greek Yas, is the sun, *as the Orb of Life*). Compare Exodus iii. 14.

As, compounded with Am, the sun, gives Semo, the Italian god of heaven, Sam or Sem, the sun-names of the Hebrew patriarch and the Persian hero. Shem is a name of the sun. Shemes and Shemir are well-known names of the sun, according to Rawlinson. We find also Shem.aiah, Shimei, Sam-ael, Ishm-ael, and Sam-uel, in the Bible, and G-eshem.

A further compound with An or Ani, the sun, is found in the name Baal-saman, or Baal-haman. This Saman, Haman, or Amon, the sun, is the Phœnician Esmun, (Apollo), Smun; Smin-theus, the name of Apollo's priest, is very near Eshmun-iad (a Phœnician name), the Egyptian Os-im-an-th-yas or Os-im-an-d-yas. Summan-us is the Italian god of the nightly lightnings. The Bible-names Sim-eon and Simon appear to be the same word.

The Irish Cuat-an, "the sun," is perhaps Achad, the sun, and On, the sun. In Sanskrit, Kut is the verb "to burn"; we have also Ct-esi-as (Achad+Asi), the writer, and Acteon, who was changed to a stag (Achad, the sun, and eon, ian, Ani, the sun).

Further compounds may be found in the words Zur-iel, Beth-Zur, אליאל Eli-el, אליהו Eli-jah, ואהיה Ahiah, As-ah-iah, ואיה Ajah, יה Jah, Jehu (Jahoa) יהוא, Jael יעל,* An-aiiah,† Jah-ziel,‡ Jah-azi-el,§ Elihu, Joel יואל, Mor-iah, a mountain, Azar-iah, Seraiah, Zerubbabel, Jaaz-an.i.ah, Ar-ab-el, king of Babyl-on, Ari-el, Ar-eli,|| Al-or-us אל-אור, Ar-ieh,¶ Ariad.ne (Adoni, Ἀδωνι), As-ahel, Ash-bel, Esh-baal, S-ab-ellians, S-av-elios, the sun, Abelios, the sun, β-αβελios, the sun, Saul and Ausil, the sun; Saul, Sol-El, Soleil, the sun, and J-ah-leel, a Bible-name.

The Selli were the priests of Jove at Dodona, called also the ἑλλοί (Helli). In Greece, El-is was "the Holy Land." Greece (Hellas) is called Elisha in the Bible. The connection of the Phœnicians with Ionia was most intimate; yet the Hebrew name of Greece, יון (I-o-n) is translated Javan. This is not remarkable in so distant a nation as the Hindus, but in countries near together, as Palestine, Phœnicia, and the Ionian coast, it would be strange if the Greek name should not be used, more especially as we find Elion and Elon, names of the chief god in Phœnicia, Elion and El, or Eli in Judæa, Il-ion, Troy (Il is El), Ach-illes (Ach-il), and other names that have apparently the same composition which we have been describing. Thamyrus in Homer resembles Baal-Tamar, and Tamar, the name of

* Judges iv. 18, 21.

§ 2 Chron. xx. 14.

† Nehem-iah x. 22.

|| Genesis xlvi.

‡ 1 Chron. vii. 13.

¶ 2 Kings xv. 25.

a princess in the Bible. Neptune is Ani, Ap, Adon; Sar-pedon is Asar-Ap-Adan. In the Bible we find Padan, the name of a place; Dardan-us is Adar-Adon. Ias and Jan (On) are names of the sun. Combined, they make Jas-on, the leader of the Argonauts, and Jas-on, a Christian mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles.

We find a Hebrew Jam-l-ech, also Melech, a name of Moloch or Milichus, the fire-sun; Am-al-ak, the Amalekites, compounds of Am (or Jom, meaning day), El (Bel), and Ak (the Arabian god Yauk); Mal-eh-iel, the name of a person, M-al-achi, the prophet, Malach-bel, or Baal-Moloch. We have Abi-Melech or Abimelech in the Bible. Melech, the wife of Mars-Moloch, Alamm-el-ech, An.amm.el-ech, and Adramme-lech, or Adar-Melech, names of Assyrian fire-gods. Also C-y.b-ele, a goddess (Ach+bel).

Malchi-Zedek was priest of the most high God, the Elon or Elion of the Phœnicians, and dwelt in Salem, the ancient Jerusalem. In Assyria, the priest bore the name of the god to whose service he was attached. Perseus was the name of the priest of Mithra and the Persian god. So the Hebrew priest Eli bears the name of his god, Eli or El. David's seer or prophet was called Gad, from Achad, the sun.* Uri-jah, the priest, has the name of the fire-god and the sun-god united. Eli-jah, "the man of God," is named from Eli and Jah, two names of the Hebrew God; Oded, the priest's name, is Adad, the sun. Ezra, the priest, has the name of Azar, Asar, or Ahur-a, the sun.

Besides the "Shining Bar" of the Assyrian bas-reliefs, the sun-god Abar is the Roman jubar, a sunbeam, and the sun-name or epithet of the Egyptian monarchs as sons of the sun, Phar-aohs. We have also Bar, the name of an Arab tribe, the Abars, Abarti, or Afarti, a people in the northern part of the Persian Empire, and it is "Per-seus, the sun," and Persia (or Abar-As-ia), the land of the sun. We find the name of a Jewish writer, Abar-ban-el, contains the three deity names El, Aban, and Abar. Asnabar, the name of a district, city, or place in Assyria, and As-n-apper, a man's name, are As-An-(or Sun)-Abar. It is a compound of the same

* Compare the "children of Gad," Numb. x.; the Bible-names Accad and Baal-gad, the Get-ae (Goths), the German Gott, and the Persian Khoda.

order as Sandan (San-Adan, Adonis, ζήν), the Assyrian sun, as *Hercules*, whose name is but a Greek-Phœnician softening of Sarak or Asarac, the great deity of the Assyrians. H is S; therefore a compound of Sarak and El, the Phœnician and Semitic sun-god, would be Hercol, the Etrurian name of Hercules, who is also called Archal in Phœnicia. Abar is the priest Abar-is, the Trojan Par-is, Aprilis, Avr-il, months, Apri-es and Uaphr-is, kings of Egypt, and Eber, the patriarch of the Ebraioi, or Hebrews. Abar, the shining sun, is compounded with Ak, the fire-god, in *Kh-eper*, the Egyptian name of the Creator-sun. We find a river *Ch-ebur* mentioned in Ezekiel,* and the name *Ch-epar* = haamonai, in the eighteenth chapter of Joshua. With these we may compare Sultan *K-ebir*, meaning "Fire-Sultan," *Gh-eber*, a fire-worshipper, the seven *C-abiri*, the spirits of fire and light of Phœnicia, the seven "great gods" of the Eastern World, *G-abr-iel*, one of the seven archangels, and *Ch-eb-r-es*, king of Egypt. Jacob is a compound of Ak, the fire-sun, and Ap or Ab, "the sun." The same names differently compounded give *B-acch-us*. Further compounds are *Caphtor* (a name of the island Crete), which is Ak, Ap, Ad, Ar, and Coptos or Aigupt-os, "Egypt," which is Ak, Ap, and Ad; or *Kah-Ptah*, "the land of Ptah." (?) Other compounds of Abar are *Britomartis*, a name of Diana, *Per-seph-one* and *Pr-osser-pine*.

Britomart-is is *Abar-Adam-Arad* (*Artem-is*, Diana). *Persephone* is *Abar*, *Asaph*, and *Ani*. *Proserpina* is *Abar*, *Asar*, the Assyrian chief-god, and *Aban*, the sun. *Abar* is found in *Iber-ia*, the land of *Abar*, the sun, *Ber-iah*, *Bar-ak*, and *Bar-uch*, *Ber-ech-iah*, which is *Abar-Ach-Iah* (the sun Iao with four faces). "The Shining Bar," and "Ani the King," of the Assyrian inscriptions, seem to have united in forming *Var-una*, the Hindu Saturn, the god of Heaven and Light. We find *Ver-ona* in Italy, *Var-na*, on the Black Sea, the *Var-ani*, a people of Bactria, and the river *Var*,† named from the god *Bar*, just as the river *Don* (or *Tanais*) is named from the sun *Adan*, his goddess *Tanais* = *Athena* (*Minerva*), and *Adana*, the name of a province in Asia Minor.

We have in the Bible *Bar-zillai*, a person (*Abar* and

* Chap. x.

† Verres and Varro.

Azel, אֶזֶל, or Asel or Sol, As-iel and Sol-omon (Amon, a Jewish king). We have also Par-an, a place, Beor, a man's name, Baal-peor, Phre, the sun-god in Egypt, Phar-par, a river, and El-Par-an. Pri-ene, a European town, is Abar and Ani; Prusa, the modern Bur-sa, is Abar (Bar) and As (the sun). We find Paarai, Beeri, Beri, Bible-names; Bera, king of Sodom, the Trojan Priam, and a city of Cal-*abr*-ia, in Italy, named Bari; also *Br*-undusium, *S-ybar*-is, cities, Epure, an Italian name of Apollo, Pur, the Greek word for fire, Epir-us, a country, Ephher, a Hebrew name, the Persian fire-altar Pyr-ethon, the word pyre, which, softened, is "fire," the German feuer, and the French foyer.

Compounds of As, Ar, and On (names of the sun) are *Jesh-ur-un*, the land of Moses, *S-or-an-us*, the deity-name, the *S-ur-ani*, a people north of the Caucasus, the Saron-ic Gulf, Sharon (or *Sar-ona*), *H-ar-an* and *Beth-horon*, names of places in the Bible. Ar and On give *Ur-an-os*, or *Our-an-os* ("Heaven," or Saturn, which is *Seth-uran-us*, the *El-Shaddai*, *Sadi*, *Set*, or *Seth* of *Genesis*, *Seth-os*, a king of Egypt); *Sal-ernum* (now *Sal-erno*) is *Sol-uranus*. We have *Ir-ene*, the Empress (Ar and Ani), also *Aur-ana*, a place in Arabia.

Ag, the fire-god Ak, compounded with *Ur-an-os*, gives "Ekron, whose god was Baal-zebub," *K-ron-os*, "the beaming sun," a name of Saturn (*Ak-Ar-On*), *Car-ni*, a people of Italy, and *Oc-r-an*, a district in Palestine. Ak, compounded with the fire-god Ar, gives *Er-ech*, a part of Nimrod's kingdom, and the Bible-name *Jer-icho*. We have also *K-ur*, a name of the sun (*Ak+Ar*), *Kur*, a river, *Cyr-us* (*Kur-us*), the Persian king, *Kyp-ios* meaning "lord" in Greek, *Cher-es*, king of Egypt, *Kore*, the name of a Hebrew, the Roman *Cur-io*, *Kur-eta* (the island Crete), *Achor*, the name of a valley in the Bible, the island *Cor-cyra* (*Kur-Kur*), *Acar-n-ania* and *Chor-assan*, countries; the Bible-name of a place, *Gur-baal* (two sun-names), and the proper names *Khor-ene*, *Cyr-ene*, and *Cyr-il* (El and Kur).

Other compounds of the fire-god Ag are *Ch-esil* (Orion), *Ac-usil-aus*, *Agni*, the Hindu god of fire (*Ak* and *Ani*, the sun, the Latin *Ignis*, "fire"), *D-agōn*, the sun-god represented with the tail of a fish, in Phœnicia, *Od-acon*, the Babylonian "man-fish," *Coni*, a fortress

in Piedmont, Chon, Chaon, or Chiun (Chijun), a name of Saturn in Africa, Palestine, and Arabia, the deity Baal-chon, the Bible-name Guni, Jam-ad-agni, a Hindu deity-name (Jama or Jom, meaning "the day," the sun). We have the patriarch Pel-eg, of the Bible (Apel and Ag), Bal-ak (Baal or Abel-ak), the Pel-igni-ans, a people of Italy, the Pel-agoni-ans, Tel-egon-us, Ægina, and The-ognis. Here we distinctly have the Latin Ignis, fire, and Agni, the Indian god of fire.

Aban is the sun, and a Persian name of a month. Laban (El-Aban) is a patriarch in Genesis. Even-us, a Grecian king, is the name Aban. Pan, the Roman sun-god, Phan-es, the Phœnician deity, Venus (the sun-goddess), and the name of Lake Van, follow as a matter of course. Aban is seen in Al-apeni and Sal-apeni, people of West Arabia, in Jabin (iAban), a king of Can-aan, in the Hebrew Ben-jam.in, Eben-ezer, Re-uben (Aban). Ra, Re, and Phre are Egypt's names of the sun. We have the Jew Abar-ban-el, the Hebrew name Ish-pan, a compound similar to Esh-baal and El-paal (Pallu, Apollo), Abana, a river, *Pen-eus*, a river of Th-es-saly, *Pni-el* and *Pen-uel*, Bible-names.

We have Beth-aven, a Bible-name, H-av.an or H-av-ani, a god of the Persians, the Hindu Ven, meaning the sun, and Vena, the moon; Van-iah, a Hebrew name, the Sanskrit Van-as-pati, Pati meaning ruler (rulers anciently were sons of the sun), Bani and Beon, Bible-names, Byon, king of Egypt, and Neb-ushas-ban, an Assyrian name. Neb is Nebo (Mercury), "ban" is Aban (or Pan, the sun).

Ushas is the name of Aurora, the blushing dawn. The words As (Ush) and Ar (Ur), both meaning sun or fire, are very much interchanged, just as Adar and Asar, two names of the same deity, are put one for the other. Tyre in Phœnicia is called Sur by the Turks. Assy-ria is Athur-ia. "Ur" changes to "As" in the Latin verb to burn, Uro, which in the perfect is Ussi, supine Ustum. The Aur-el-ian family were anciently the Auselii (from Ausil, the sun). So Ush-asa is in Persia and Hindustan the dawn; in Italy it is Aur-ora, in Lithuania it is Auss-ra (compare Auz-ara, an ancient city on the Euphrates), in Greece it is Eōs, Doric Aōs, and Eolic Auōs. Compounded with Ina (the sun) we have

the Persian Ush-as-ina, the goddess of the morning. Aur-ora is Ar-Ar. Ush-as is Ush-Ush, or *As, As*. With these compare the Arab god Asas, "*As-is*," a solar Mercury, *παρεδρος* of the sun-god at Edessa, Zeus (Jupiter), Zia, Ziz, and Aziza, Bible-names, Aziz, the Dev(il) of the Zend-avesta, Jahaz, a Hebrew, Ah-az, a king. Is-is, the Egyptian wife of the sun (Osir-is), S-is-era, of the Bible, S-is-er-es, king of Egypt, Isa-iah (*h* being a soft *s*), Ozias, Uzziah, Jos-iah, Shish-ak, an Egyptian king, and S-is-ythr-us (Xisuthrus, the Babylonian Noah), whose name is probably a compound of Asis and Adar, the sun and fire gods. We have also S-usa, a city of S-usi-āna, in Persia, S-os-is, a Syracusan, S-os-us, Asi-us, a poet, and the Lacedæmonian name of Ze-us, Si-os.

It was a principle of ancient mythology, that the female forms an essential part of the conception of the deities. They are found in pairs. The Greeks, Romans, and other nations did not hesitate to pair those of different names together. Venus is the wife of Vulcan, but she bears the name of Pan. Juno is the spouse of Jupiter, yet she has the name of the Etruscan deity, Jonn. If they were paired according to their names, we should have

Amon, the sun,	Manes,	{	Mana, the Oscan goddess of birth.
Minos,		{	Meni, the Babylonian Venus.
Ar-es,	"	Er-os,	Rhea, the Earth goddess.
Atmu, <i>Τωμ</i>	"	Re-Athom,	
Adam,			Tamie,* the moon.
Achad,	"		Hecate, the moon.
Moloch,	"		Melecheth.
Ap,	"		Ap-ia (Greece), the Earth.
Op,	"		Ops, the earth.
Ab,	"		Ava, Eva (Eve), the Earth.
Evius,	"	(a Sun-	
Bacchus,)			Evia.
Ao,	"		Aue, a meadow ; Io, the moon.
Jah,	"		Aia, the Earth, and Joh, the moon, in Egypt.

* Tamie is both masculine and feminine.

As, the sun, Zeus,* Sios,	Asia.
Ishi,†	
Assur, the sun,	Assyria.
Arad, the sun, Jared,	Erde (Gothic Airtha), the Earth, Arit-imis.
Iom (day), the sun, Ami,	Maia, Mai, May, the Earth.
Jama, “	Jami, the Earth.
Il, “	Ila, the Earth.
Ad, “	Aida, Ida, the Earth.
Ak, Fire-god, the sun,	Ach-aia (Greece), the Earth.
Adam, “	Dem-eter, Earth goddess.
Adonis, “	Tana-is, Diana, Earth goddess.
Anakos, the sun,	{ The Egyptian Anuke, the Earth.
Inachus, “	
Ven (sun),	{ The Babylonian Onka, the goddess of Chaotic Matter.
Pan, Phan-es, Aven (sun),	Vena, the moon, a Hindu word.
Jan-us, the sun,	Ven-us, the Earth goddess.
Jonn, “	Jana.
Uran-us, Saturn,	Juno.
Asar (Ahura), “	Urani-a, celestial Venus.
Azar, “	Hera (Juno, queen of heaven).
Asher (Baal, the sun),	Azara.
Asis (sun),	Ashera, Baal's goddess in Israel.
Adad (sun),	Isis, the Earth goddess.
Silen-us (a Sun-Bacchus),	Tit-aea, the Earth.
Hephaestus (fire-god of Greece),	Selen-e, the moon.
Apollo (sun),	Vesta, Roman fire-goddess.
Pales (Androgyne),	Pallas.
Kur (the sun),	Pales, goddess of cattle.
	{ Cora, the Earth.
	{ Cer-es, goddess of corn, &c.
	{ Charis, wife of Vulcan.

* Compare the Bible-names Uz, Az-ael, Uzzi-el, El-uzai, Jaaz-iah, Eli-asis, Dion-usos, the god Asis, and the Arabian deities Asas and Al-uzza.

† Hosea ii. 16.

Epure (Abar), Apollo's name.	Pyrrha, Deucalion's wife.
Adar (the fire-sun),	Terra, the Earth.
Jup-iter (the sun-god),	Terra, the Earth.
Tal (the Assyrian sun-god,	
Talaïos in Crete),	Tell-us, the Earth.

We have thus collected words of various countries, and divided them into the monosyllabic and dissyllabic names of sun-gods, of which they are compounded. It ought to cause no more surprise to find the god-names of Mesopotamia spread to the remotest extremities of Europe or to Hindustan, than to remark the resemblances in the languages of mankind from India to Ireland. The Latin word *genitor* is in Greek *genetῆρ*, in Sanskrit *ganitâr*, in Irish *genteoir*. The words "I am" are in old French "is,mi"; in old Prussian, *esmi*; in Doric Greek, *esmi* or *emmi*; in Sanskrit, *asmi*. "He is" is in Sanskrit *asti*; in Greek, *esti*; in Zend, *asti*; in Darius's inscriptions, *astya*; in Latin, *est*; in German, *ist*; in French, *est*. The Latin "do" (or dare), to give, is in Egyptian *Ta*; in Lithuanian, *Dumi*; in Sanskrit, *Dādāmi*; in Greek, *Didōmi*; in the Hebrew, *Na-than*; in the Arabian, *Ata* (a gift); in the old Persian, *Tatam*, the participle (given); in the new Persian, *Dih* and *Dadan*, to give. Father is in Gothic *Fader*; in German, *Vater*; in Latin, *Pater*; in Greek, *Patῆρ*; in Sanskrit, *Pitar*. Boy is (Niederbretan) *paothra*, in Sanskrit *putra*, in Latin *puer*, in Greek *pais* (pronounced *pois*). Seven is the Gothic *sibun*, the German *sieben*, the Hebrew *seba*, the Latin *septem*, the Lithuanian *septyni*, the French *sept*, the Greek *hepta*, the Zend *hapta*, the Sanskrit *sapta* and *saptan*, the Arabic *sabatun*, the Ethiopian *saba-e-tu*, and the Egyptian *shash-fe* or *sas'f*.

Thus it is evident that there was a communication of ideas between all parts of the ancient world; language overflowed from one mouth to another.

Babylon lay on the Euphrates surrounded by artificial canals, and mistress of two great rivers. She was between Assyria, Persia, India, Egypt, Palestine, Asia Minor, and Europe. The Bible assigns to her the chief rank among the cities. She was "the first-born" in point of time. From Europe and India names are brought back to her as the source from which they

sprung. Second mother of mankind! The human intellect was cradled in her arms as she sat amidst her many waters. Her Magi went out, like the Apostles of Christ, bearing to other nations her language, her religion, her philosophy, her civilization. Like the Assyrian, "the waters made him great; the deep set him up on high with her rivers running round about his plants, and sent out her *little rivers* unto all the trees of the field."

S. F. D.

ART. VI. — MOTLEY'S DUTCH REPUBLIC.*

THE work whose title we give below has the usual historical interest for all who love to watch the development of great critical periods, when conflicting forces seem fully roused and aware of their purposes, and the numerous causes which have been toiling obscurely to provide human passions with a striking occasion, all at once attain their end. But a far higher interest summons to the perusal of these volumes on the Dutch Republic every man who believes that liberty of conscience and of worship, freedom of speech, of person, and of labor, of the press and of the political debate, are the elements of national greatness. A book so significant in these respects, and so capable of affording striking parallels with the present, has seldom appeared under the title of a history. If the love of freedom would learn the full extent of patience and tenacity contained in its own principle, if liberal parties desire to see what energy is developed by continual mortifications and defeats, what a victory is finally granted to the men who suffer for the sake of no selfish hopes, and if the Protestant would understand how pitiless a dominant hierarchy can be that is possessed by the idea of its own infallibility, let him read Mr. Motley's powerful book. Here are reasons enough to prevent us from shrinking at sight of these three Dutch-built volumes, which come down rather

* *The Rise of the Dutch Republic. A History.* By JOHN LOTHROP MOTLEY. In three volumes. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1856. 8vo. pp. 579, 582, 664.

solemnly into this shoal of small craft, slid from all our back-yards and mud-creeks, that threaten to block the way. Here are the romance and pathos of more than twenty years of terrible suffering, during which situations more dramatic than any pen of fancy has achieved were extorted from the sword's point, wrung from the rack, created from the faith and blood of men.

And it seems as if history had determined to establish a *Dutch* republic, to qualify for ever our rhetoric about the patriotism of the mountaineer, and the inaccessible fastnesses of freedom. The classical scholar loves to recollect the rocky walls which hemmed in the garden of Sparta, and the ravines which so long sheltered the tough old Ligurian republic. The popular orator generally attempts the ascent of Mont Blanc: his tropes skip like chamois among the rocks where hardy freedom dwells; the Alps are his citadel; avalanches are the vengeance of a long slumbering but at length awakened people; those specks of floating eagles are the high thoughts of a free intelligence; patches of vivid green and fragrant roses are the simple virtues of this inviolate asylum of the race. To correct this florid tendency, History takes us down relentlessly out of this mountain air, nor pauses till at the mouth of the Rhine, where the silt of the Alps spreads into a spongy soil below the sea-level, she plants the old liberty. The contrast is complete: we have gone so far from the stiffening glacier that the green water topples and threatens twenty feet overhead, and man must call his country into existence by first establishing its shores. Here, along the outer edge of these marshes, the people are obliged to keep up their dikes to prevent freedom from being swallowed by the tide. Or if tyranny becomes too threatening, they break down the massive barriers of earth and willow, and drench with brine their fat acres for the sake of drowning out those Spanish rats which gnaw them. Along the narrow embankments, which were the only roads over a trenched and drained country, the obstinate burgher and the disciplined veteran of Alva struggled for the mastery; deploying was out of the question, grappling was the only movement possible. In the course of those tedious campaigns, the canals which divided the soil into its arable patches drowned more

human beings than were slaughtered by the steel. And if a beleaguered city, reduced to its last horse for sustenance, could not be relieved in any other way, those hardy sailors of Zealand would bring their vessels through ruptured dikes, over a flowed country, up the village streets and among the branches of orchards, till the prows touched the city walls. The iron will of despotism yielded at length to the sincerity of these men, who knew how to destroy their country in order to save it; and who, as well as the Swiss, counted the advantages of their situation. So superior is freedom to tyranny, whether delving below the ocean surface, or hunting on the flanks of mighty hills.

Mr. Motley opens his work with a valuable introduction, which condenses the principal facts in the history of Holland, from the time of Cæsar's invasion to the abdication of Charles V. This portion of the work is admirably done. The reader must not slur it, in haste to reach the more dramatic-looking pages which succeed. He derives correctly, and characterizes with skill, the various races which were the original occupants of Holland and Belgium. He gives to Cæsar's Commentary the life and scenery of the country. Then follows the account of the introduction of Christianity, where we have this specimen of natural theology:—

“The new Mayor of the Palace,” under the Merovingian Pepin, “soon drove the Frisian Radbod (A. D. 692) into submission, and even into Christianity. A bishop's indiscretion, however, neutralized the apostolic blows of the Mayor. The pagan Radbod had already immersed one of his royal legs in the baptismal font, when a thought struck him. ‘Where are my dead forefathers at present?’ he said, turning suddenly upon Bishop Wolfran. ‘In hell, with all other unbelievers,’ was the imprudent answer. ‘Mighty well,’ replied Radbod, removing his leg. ‘Then will I rather feast with my ancestors in the halls of Woden, than dwell with your little starveling band of Christians in heaven.’ Entreaties and threats were unavailing. The Frisian declined positively a rite which was to cause an eternal separation from his buried kindred, and he died as he had lived, a heathen.”

Not long after this, however, Charles the Hammer enforced the Christian dispensation in a great battle which occurred A. D. 750, and the Frisians very sensibly com-

pounded for present life by a theoretical surrender of future intercourse with their forefathers.

During the long reign of feudalism in the Netherlands, three forces were slowly preparing the country for the enjoyment of municipal and social rights, many of which appeared to steal almost insensibly out of the midst of the tumult, and to win a prescription that kings could not neutralize. Mr. Motley condenses the features of several centuries in his exhibition of the forces of the sword, of the clergy, and of gold. Under the reign of gold, independent municipalities were developed all over Holland, and in maintaining these her thrifty children learned much of the business of freedom; without claiming a technical share in the government, they yet modified it by obstinately adhering to their local interests and usages, and without comprehending all the human rights which make a people truly free, they were slowly preparing a happy issue for the great struggle in the sixteenth century, when the republic was born. Such independent vigor, such confidence and practical wisdom, existed nowhere else under any feudal government. Mr. Motley traces the origin of the borough, the guild, the charter, the popular election of chief magistrate and aldermen, and shows what inroads prosperous communities made upon the prerogative of the sovereign. Then the trade with England, the Mediterranean, and the East expands. Under these prosperous conditions we hardly care to know who is Count of Holland, how or when the countship fell to different houses, how a Duke of Bavaria gets himself established there (1354), or how the beautiful Jacqueline, in 1417, finds herself cursed with the rule of these turbulent provinces. By her death she transfers them to the house of Burgundy, in 1437, thus connecting the countries, hitherto isolated, with the general policy of Europe.

But at this epoch, under Philip the Good, founder of the order of the Golden Fleece, a change commenced in the fortunes of the Netherlands. "The spirit of liberty seemed to have been typified in the fair form of the benignant and unhappy Jacqueline, and to be buried in her grave. The usurper, who had crushed her out of existence, now strode forward to trample upon all the laws and privileges of the provinces which had formed

her heritage." Philip declared null and void all the constitutions to which he had sworn as the guardian of Jacqueline. By this stroke he entered upon power without a pledge to restrain him; and he inaugurated the policy of restraint and unjust interference which continued till the time of Orange. But Mr. Motley shows how, in the mean while, the material prosperity of the country was increasing. "The natural sources of power were full to overflowing, while the hand of despotism was deliberately sealing the fountain." And here too we find one of those striking contrasts which Mr. Motley delights to present, between Philip the Good, at the height of his power, and Lawrence Coster, the poor sexton of Harlem, whose little grammar printed from wooden types taught freedom its parts of speech.

Charles the Bold succeeded Philip. Among the privileges which Holland still retained, the *jus de non evocando*, "the right of every Hollander to be tried in his own land," was invaded by Charles, who proclaimed that the supreme council, composed of his creatures, was to follow his person and represent his will. And afterwards, when Philip the Second endeavored to enforce the authority of this council, he lent an element to the great revolution.

We must hasten over the crowding and significant points of this masterly introduction. After the death of Charles, the oppressed provinces at a single bound recover almost all their ancient rights. And they wring from his child, the Lady Mary, the "Great Privilege," which embodied the fundamental law of the land, and secured recognition for the existence of the people. It was often trampled upon; nevertheless, it held the roots of the republic. The Lady Mary marries Maximilian of Austria, and the government passes from the house of Burgundy. Her son, Philip the Fair, receives the homage of the different states of the Netherlands, in 1494. He ignores the "Great Privilege," and swears to support only the constitutions granted by Philip and Charles of Burgundy. And the provinces abjectly put themselves beneath his feet. He marries, in 1496, Joanna, daughter of Ferdinand and Isabella of Castile, and Charles V., who unites Spain and the Netherlands under one sceptre, is the fruit of this union.

Mr. Motley has a fine chapter indicating the political character of Charles's administration on occasion of the great insurrection at Ghent. That uproarious city of the Flemings is described as it has never been before; he gives us, in half a dozen pages, picturesque elements enough to set up a modern mediæval novel. He and the reader are by-standers while the great bell Roland rings a hundred thousand armed workingmen into the streets, where they beleaguer the town-hall with its Gothic and Moorish fronts, to destroy the infamous "calf-skin" which had curtailed their liberties. We see the magnificent display at the entry of the Emperor Charles, when the doomed city had easy hospitality for sixty thousand strangers with their fifteen thousand horses. And all the shifting pictures of the time close with the pompous theatrical ceremony which Charles had invented, at once to forgive and to humiliate the rebellious city.

The religious condition of the Netherlands must be understood before we can estimate all the revolutionary elements which drove Philip II. out of his provinces. We can easily imagine that this audacious and prosperous people had handled the pretences of the clergy with ungloved hands. They had also been accustomed, from the twelfth century, to discuss points of theology with a freedom which must have been unparalleled even in Germany, if we may judge from the excesses committed by various impostors, who found their brief countenance in the liberal disposition of the cities. Holland was always inquisitive and protesting. Flanders, with its predominating Gallic population, had greater inclination for the visible pomp of the Church's ceremonial, and always held that light to be the best which fell through its unrivalled windows of stained glass. In this respect, the Flemish citizens were on better terms with the bigotry of Philip and Alva, who made the destruction of the stained windows at the Hague, Leyden, Ypres, and other places, in 1566, the last pretext to let loose their vengeance upon the provinces. Still, it is clear that a wide-spread religious dissatisfaction gave cohesion to all the material and political causes of the revolution. Those cities revolted most vigorously in which the sentiments of Luther and Erasmus were most popular. On the one hand, the Inquisition proposed to crush out polit-

ical revolt, as well as religious freedom; on the other hand, religious freedom was constantly encouraging and maintaining the people in their attitude of revolt. As early as the commencement of the twelfth century, the career of heretics and reformers had commenced. Between Tauchelyn and John of Leyden, more than four centuries were filled with false prophets, whose influence over the populace alternated with that of numerous sects, Waldenses, Perfectists, Lollards, Arnaldists, who waged a war of intellect with Rome. Tauchelyn, a man of gross habits and destructive views, lived in Antwerp like an Eastern satrap; three hundred guards attended his steps, the people imagined divine qualities in the water in which he washed, and the announcement of his approaching marriage with the Virgin Mary drew contributions of money from an immense crowd who came to witness the ceremony. His success was so great, that he travelled to Rome, proselyting as he went. Yet the Bible and the Reformation were cherished in the same popular bosom that contained these bestial and superstitious elements. Such contrasts are likely to appear in any community; but the vivid, audacious, and expansive temper of the Netherlands clothed them in terrible and dramatic colors. The people always painted like Rubens, giving to their flesh and to their faith the same glow and broadness, lavishing the same naked sincerity upon their vilest and purest emotions. The same people of Antwerp who permitted Tauchelyn to make every house his harem, who drank the contents of his wash-basin, and who rushed with infatuation to see the Virgin's image which he married, afterwards displayed a Protestant rage as great as this Catholic devotion, and plunged their daggers into the body of Mary, and tore off her embroidered garments with a contempt as whole-souled as their respect. In 1566, the famous onslaught of the Iconoclasts occurred, and the great cathedral felt the revenge which time wrought through the children of Tauchelyn's devotees. "Indefatigably, audaciously, endowed, as it seemed, with preternatural strength and nimbleness, these furious Iconoclasts clambered up the dizzy heights, shrieking and chattering like malignant apes, as they tore off in triumph the slowly-matured fruit of centuries. The statue of Christ was wrenched from its place with

ropes and pulleys, while the malefactors, with bitter and blasphemous irony, were left on high. . . . A troop of harlots, snatching waxen tapers from the altars, stood around the destroyers and lighted them at their work." This mob dashed in pieces every crucifix and image in the recesses at the street-corners, sacked thirty churches, burned the libraries of monasteries, and left all the ancient wine and ale running, invaded the nunneries, and put the mark of their retribution wherever a picture or a statue symbolized a hated priesthood. What wild forms and colors starting from the glooms of Rembrandt! "Yet the rage was directed exclusively against stocks and stones. Not a man was wounded, nor a woman outraged. A monk who had been in the prison of the Barefoot Monastery for twelve years, recovered his freedom. Art was trampled in the dust, but humanity deplored no victims."

What incompatible but bold and muscular traits in this mob of two or three hundred men! Their midnight rage was lighted by sacred tapers in the hands of harlots as they tore Christ away from the company of the thieves, who represented priestly corruption, and they returned every coin and jewel that their indiscriminate arms had scattered on the pavements! Such a mob was a caricature of the broadness and sincerity in which the people chose to clothe all their emotions. But justice, faith, and self-devotion were set forth with the same sensuous heartiness belonging to men who had drained, fished, manufactured, invented, built, and thought for themselves for centuries.

The French Bible, translated by Waldo, was "rendered into Netherland rhyme," and men read it openly and with enthusiasm. Dr. Grandfort, of Groningen, preaches everywhere against the infallibility of the Pope, prayers for the dead, and the doctrines of purgatory and absolution, before Luther has opened with his attack upon indulgences. The doctrines of Wickliffe had long been espoused. And at length the shrewd pen of Erasmus encourages the spirit of Luther, dissects without mercy the vices of the clergy, and sets the polished intellect of the whole land fermenting with the truth. By way of contrast and exaggeration, great numbers suffer themselves to be misled by the Anabaptists,

who, between the Church and the Reformers, have little chance short of extermination. "In 1526, Felix Mants is drowned at Zurich, in obedience to Zwingle's pithy formula, — *Qui iterum mergit mergatur*. The Germans, Muncer and Hoffman, had been succeeded, as chief prophets, by a Dutch baker, named Matthiszoon, of Harlem, who announced himself as Enoch." John of Leyden was his disciple, the joint plunderer of Munster, where humanity and decency were outraged, as if to put in strong colors before the clergy their own habits and translate their veiled grossness into the vernacular. We may shrink with horror from the blasphemy and cruelty of these low-bred fanatics, but we cannot help seeing that their acts were the satire of nature upon sanctimonious corruption, and that the condition of the Church was reflected in the degradation of its opposers. Jacobinism reduces in blood and tears the appalling statistics of every demoralized society. The Netherlanders enacted this historical justice in a way that had less malice in it than sensuality. The insurgent or fanatic Gaul in Flanders travestied divine and human authority, and indulged even his passions on the plea of some old polygamic scripture. He smote his enemies and spoiled their goods under the intense conviction that they were Amalekites and people of Ai. A perverted and darkened capacity for believing in some kind of invisible truth lent some method to his lowest excesses. The Gaul in Paris never became fanaticized by men like Matthiszoon and John of Leyden, who cursed, killed, ravished, and confiscated, with their sensual hearts puffed by patriarchal reminiscences. There was not popular scripture enough to run mad in such a way. The revolts of the *sans culottes* went to sheer malice and desperation, to a cruelty that was impassive, and not brawny, humorous, and beer-fed, to a deliberate official recognition of the non-existence of any objects of religious faith, and to the parade of a harlot as a goddess. This difference is traceable to the long impunity during which the Netherlander wove and sold his cloth, salted his herrings, cherished his municipal rights, and brooded over the passion and vengeance of the Old Testament. In Holland, where faith was clearer, and the clergy had earlier lost their control over the minds of men, excesses were less

frantic and cruel, and more deliberately committed, in the name of some principle or question. "On a cold winter's night (February, 1535), seven men and five women, inspired by the Holy Ghost, threw off their clothes, and rushed naked and raving through the streets, shrieking, 'Woe, woe, woe! The wrath of God! the wrath of God!' When arrested, they obstinately refused to put on clothing. 'We are,' they observed, 'the naked truth.'" This unphlegmatic scene occurred in Amsterdam, where, as in Germany, millennial texts seemed to have predestined the sombre aspect of the age.

During all these troubles, the policy of the government was overbearing, indiscriminate, stung by a madness akin to that which it strove to suppress: so that the most moderate men became disgusted, and secretly favored the enthusiasm of the field-preachers of Calvinistic doctrine. An imperial edict condemned all heretics to death. The poor old woman who read her Bible by stealth was hunted out and crushed as summarily as John of Leyden. A cobbler in Mons was hanged for having eaten meat-soup on Friday. Paupers were executed for the crime of taking alms dispensed at Protestant preachings. A tapestry-weaver of Tournay, having copied a portion of a Genevan book of hymns, was burned alive. Schoolmasters who were "addicted to reading the Bible" were strangled and then burnt. An old lady of eighty-four years, who had given a field-preacher a night's lodging, was carried to the scaffold in a chair, to be beheaded.

"A poor Anabaptist, guilty of no crime but his fellowship with a persecuted sect, had been condemned to death. He had made his escape, closely pursued by an officer of justice, across a frozen lake. It was late in the winter, and the ice had become unsound. It trembled and cracked beneath his footsteps, but he reached the shore in safety. The officer was not so fortunate. The ice gave way beneath him, and he sank into the lake, uttering a cry for succor. There were none to hear him, except the fugitive whom he had been hunting. Dirk Willemzoon, for so was the Anabaptist called, instinctively obeying the dictates of a generous nature, returned, crossed the quaking and dangerous ice at the peril of his life, extended his hand to his enemy, and saved him from certain death. Unfortunately for human nature, it cannot be added that the generosity of the action was met by a corresponding heroism. The officer was

desirous, it is true, of avoiding the responsibility of sacrificing the preserver of his life, but the burgomaster of Asperen sternly reminded him of his oath."

The unfortunate policeman accordingly overcame his prejudices, arrested his preserver, and kept his oath at the expense of all that in his soul which should make an oath worth taking. We wonder which appeared to him the better, as his victim slowly roasted at the stake, his oath as constable or his obligations as a man! Does not every epoch of legal anarchy reproduce the same hideous features in the name of law and order? Surely Providence owed a republic to the brethren of this Christian fugitive. And so long as Divine justice is held in reserve, invisible and impalpable to the wrath of men who take oaths against Christ, the supporters of the golden rule will be able to collect that debt of conscience and freedom.

Compared with such a violation of nature done in the name of government, (as if to emasculate a man were the same as to govern him,) the attacks which were made upon Catholic sensibilities appear merely technical; as when, for instance, Bertrand le Blas committed a crime which was inconceivable in the estimation of that epoch. On Christmas day, he stationed himself near the altar, and when the priest elevated the consecrated host, he rushed forward, snatched the wafer from the fingers of the astonished official, and cried aloud, as he broke it in pieces, "Misguided men! do ye take this thing to be Jesus Christ, your Lord and Saviour?" He then trampled the fragments beneath his feet. When we read the punishment that was devised for him, it is easy to imagine that a popular revulsion might forget the violated wafer, and rather believe the spirit of the Saviour substantial in the man. But at that time it was death even to neglect kneeling in the street when the holy wafer was carried by. A poor huckster, named Simon, was taken from his booth and burned for omitting this ceremony. "In this particular case, it is recorded that the sheriff who was present at the execution was so much affected by the courage and fervor of the simple-minded victim, that he went home, took to his bed, became delirious, crying constantly, 'Ah, Simon! Simon!' and died miserably, notwithstanding," adds the

chronicler, naively, "all that the monks could do to console him."

What a period, when the contrasting emotions of the human breast filled every market-square with the pathos of high tragedy, when weavers and nobles fell into spontaneous attitudes wilder and more dramatic than art has ever conceived! How the pale fervor of the martyr shone against the purple rage of the beast, throughout this miserable country, which imperial edicts converted into one vast amphitheatre. Law thirsted for the life-blood of its victims, in the vain expectation of draining out the conscience through that stream. Conscience left its garment in the grasp of its pursuers. Law is tenacious and enduring, but immortality is more so: the sword, after all, is not so cunning of fence as the spirit. Nevertheless, it appeared to Philip II. that the sword of his governors, though sinking powerless from the grasp of each, and taken up by five of them in succession to marshal his unsleeping hate through the provinces, would finally extinguish liberty of conscience by cutting off the last of its adherents. For extermination seemed to him preferable to heresy, and he thought that a devastated country could show forth the glory of God as well as cities infested with Bible-reading and self-relying men. A glorious republic, which endured two hundred years, whose admirals swept and disputed every sea, whose merchant statesmen brought the wealth of the Indies home to aggrandize worship and freedom, whose inventive and exploring people polished the diamond, captured the whale, bleached the cloth, ennobled the canvas, and rung the sweet chimes of liberty for all Europe, was the prolonged response to Philip's delusion.

And though at the end of two hundred years the name of republic was supplanted on every national coin and emblem by the name of a king, the strength and intelligence of the people continued unimpaired. It was like a pageant of their ancient guilds, when the workman, thrusting his bulk into stately costumes, felt his thews rejoice underneath the masquerade. Holland boasts no longer the magnificence in which William of Orange and Barneveldt had clothed her; but her secondary position does not prevent her Church from being free and her people happy. And those results of Philip's tyranny

will endure so long as her dikes resist the ocean. Her consent to waive the unchallenged title of "Great Republic" was really given on that day when the Mayflower took a Bible from Delft-haven, and brought it westward with Robinson's prophetic blessing. While we are still struggling to vindicate all the truth which comes out of God's word, that slender thread is strong enough to carry our thoughts back into the days of darkness and trial; let them stand there, by the side of William of Orange, observant of the temper which compels legal persecution to release the rights of man.

The treatment which the Jews met with in the Netherlands shows how deeply rooted the sentiment of toleration was in the nature of the people. It was not a convenient afterthought which politicians used to advance their cause; and it did not spring from opposition to imperial bigotry. But the people were born with that instinct in their breasts, and illustrious refugees from every other country in Europe found grateful shelter within the walls of Dutch cities, which they enriched by their various talents. Thus the intelligence of the nation was continually recruited by minds that had suffered for opinion's sake; and we see another element of the forthcoming republic. The privileges accorded to the Jews testify in a remarkable degree to this traditional feeling of humanity and respect for conscience. In every other country of Europe the Jew was kennelled in the miserable *ghetto* or quarter assigned to him, whence he never emerged without exciting abuse and outrage. Germany, in particular, seemed to remember with vindictiveness the crucifixion of our Lord. During the Middle Ages the populace had periodical fits of hatred and terror, the imagination attributed to the Jews the most appalling crimes, and they were hunted out with unreflecting vengeance. Extortion, restriction, contumely, assault, were the normal elements of their existence. In England, all Jews were slaves, by the laws of Edward the Confessor, and their property was liable to be taken for the use of the king. There was a sliding scale or tariff of blackmail, by which they compounded for the right to live and to make money. They were pillaged and massacred upon the slightest pretext; King John fleeced them, the bishops of Henry III. put them under a species of ban,

"and when, in 1262, the barons appeared in arms to enforce the observance of the Great Charter, in order to propitiate the populace they put several hundreds of this unhappy race to the sword."* In France they were *adscripti glebæ*; if they were baptized, the rite was regarded as a declaration of bankruptcy, and the lord took possession of their effects. They were obliged to wear a badge, to avoid the society of Christians; if exiled, to buy permission to return. In Spain, a million of Jews received sentence of perpetual banishment, in 1492. The most industrious and inventive took refuge in Holland, and maintained themselves in free competition with the inhabitants, no longer subject to senseless outbreaks of popular fanaticism. "There alone," says McCullagh, "they dared at all times to breathe freely, to stand upright without fear, to remember that of one flesh hath God made all the nations of the earth."

We are enabled thus to have an idea of the temperament of the people among whom Philip established his Inquisition. There was a widely diffused intelligence thirsting for truth and high debate, ready to parry or to resist encroachments; there was the humorous and muscular audacity of men who had kept up their municipal usages for centuries; there was the instinct of unlimited toleration, which afterwards, oblivious of the rack, the flaying-knife, and the stake, abolished every penal law against Catholics introduced by the dominating Calvinism in 1583; there was the quick excitability of fraternizing guilds, which made the Flemish insurrections the most dangerous in Europe; there was the sensuality of brutes, and the fierce exaltation of Mænads tearing their victim limb from limb in religious orgies; — these were the elements against which Philip brought the veterans of his army, and the choicest devices in the torture-chamber of Madrid.

Mr. Motley, after preparing us by his fine Introduction to understand and sympathize with the epoch which he has chosen for his History, opens it with the abdication of Charles V. In our previous sketch we have anticipated a portion of the rich materials which he spreads before

* W. T. McCullagh's "Industrial History of Free Nations. Vol. II. The Dutch."

us, having drawn thence a few facts to carry out his hints of the temper of the Netherlands. They may, we hope, direct an earnest attention towards these volumes, and atone for the meagre analysis which remains to be given of the body of the History. For no analysis can be anything but a catalogue of Mr. Motley's facts; we should as soon meddle with the splendid lights and colors of the magnates of the Flemish school, as pick with our pen at these portraits, these sombre executions, these warm and flowing pageants, these days lived within beleaguered cities. They glow upon the page where all may view them.

The abdication of Charles V. took place in accordance with the programme which he had carefully drawn up, each emotion and tear fell in its proper place, and he passed off the stage gracefully, supported between his crutch and the shoulder of the Prince of Orange. He left behind him the ferocious edicts against heresy, and inquisitors well trained in their function. He left fifty thousand graves of men whose crime had been non-conformity. Philip lifted this bloody sceptre, and certainly preserved its hue while his hands could grasp it. At the age of twenty-eight he receives the Provinces from his father, and swears to support all their constitutions and privileges,—an oath which the father had invented to conciliate the people. After the campaigns against France, in which Egmont won his fame, Philip appointed Margaret of Parma as Regent of the Netherlands, and returned to Spain. In his farewell address he avoided any allusion to one of the chief grievances of the Netherlands, the presence of Spanish troops; but he demanded three millions of florins, and reminded the authorities to enforce the edicts and decrees against all heresies. The deputies of the Provinces, in their reply, besought the king to withdraw all the foreign troops, and made the withdrawal a condition to the payment of their respective quotas. The rage of the king was great at being obliged to take away with him this firm remonstrance.

The idea of a republic had not yet dawned upon the most enlightened minds in the provinces. Nothing was farther from their intention than a denial of the divine right of Philip to tax and govern them. If he would only consent to do both with a moderate respect for their

ancient privileges, no people would surpass them in loyal and filial attachment. For twenty-five years they resisted Philip's governors in his own name; to the very last, they supported the legal fiction of his supreme authority. The republic was an inevitable result of the popular elements which came to self-consciousness in the bitter air of sorrow. And though this continual deference to Philip, as king "by the grace of God," looks to us now like a flimsy insincerity, at the time it sheltered the growing freedom, and saved it from the jealous fear of all Europe. The attitude was simply that of an enterprising people, who clung to certain rights and guarantees. William of Orange would have been the first to dread the suggestion of a republic, as fatal to the security of their actual liberties. He was the first man in the Provinces who received warning of the designs of Catholic potentates to crush out freedom of speech and worship. But this happy accident had only the effect of confirming the Prince's opposition to the royal encroachments; he was still a true Catholic, though he hated the Inquisition with all the ardor of an honest man. He earned the surname of "the Silent" from the manner in which he listened to the French king's unfortunate disclosure of the great plot, "without revealing to the monarch, by word or look, the enormous blunder which he had committed." From that moment the powers of this great man were secretly devoted to his country, and used in its defence with wonderful patience, subtlety, and firmness, with a faith that encircled the cities of Holland when the tide of tyranny rose highest like their protecting dikes, and faint-hearted men rallied behind it, and thanked God for the great bulwark. But even his conversion to Calvinism brought him no nearer to a consciousness that a Catholic throne could never shelter a Protestant people. His caution prompted him to speak continually in the name of some high power, to strive for adjustments with Spain, to effect coalitions with France, to lift the shield of some established government over the trembling rights of his people. All these prudential efforts were bitterly crossed: he could not even induce the Catholic Flanders heartily to fraternize with the more Protestant Holland, though their grievances were the same. The shot of his assassin was "heard round

the world," for it cut all the ties of prudence, and summoned an afflicted nation to a sense of power. Then the dead Prince of Orange reappeared in the republican majesty which had always been latent in his life, and kings fell away from it ashamed.

The details of the successive administrations of Margaret of Parma, the Duke of Alva, Requesens, Don John of Austria, and Alexander of Parma, between the years 1559 and 1584, are the intrigues, tortures, butcheries, and sieges, the vain coalitions, the cruel treacheries, and the almost uninterrupted series of defeats, which, distilled, as it were, through the genius of William of Orange, appeared at his death converted into victory. His character was a conquest in itself: it made the most untoward circumstances subservient. His generals were defeated, his best friends died, his most trusted adherents took the enemy's gold, and opened the gates behind which Liberty was crouching,—assassins lay in wait to earn the price of his head,—Spanish valor and subtlety were always just on the point of ruining him; yet he plucked the flower safety out of all these stinging weeds. He had need to cry with his last breath, "O my God, have mercy on this poor people!" for God then seemed to have resumed the life which had been the manifestation of his mercy to a thwarted nation. But human malice fell at the same time, pushed like a miserable slave into the grave which it has just dug for a victim.

The pillar of the administration of the Duchess Margaret was Cardinal Granvelle, who supported the measure, most odious to the Provinces, by which new bishoprics were created for the express object of embodying and sustaining an Inquisition. It was a violation of provincial privileges which the king had sworn to observe. The character of the Cardinal is a good specimen of Mr. Motley's skill with the pencil.

"He knew how to govern under the appearance of obeying. He possessed exquisite tact in appreciating the characters of those far above him in rank and beneath him in intellect. He could accommodate himself with great readiness to the idiosyncrasies of sovereigns. He was a chameleon to the hand which fed him. In his intercourse with the king, he colored himself, as it were, with the king's character. He was not himself, but Philip; not the sullen, hesitating, confused Philip, but Philip endowed with

eloquence, readiness, facility. The king ever found himself anticipated with the most delicate obsequiousness, beheld his struggling ideas change into winged words without ceasing to be his own. No flattery could be more adroit. The bishop accommodated himself to the king's epistolary habits. The silver-tongued and ready debater substituted protocols for conversation, in deference to a monarch who could not speak. He corresponded with Philip, with Margaret of Parma, with every one. He wrote folios to the Duchess when they were in the same palace. He would write letters forty pages long to the king, and send off another courier on the same day with two or three additional despatches of identical date. Such prolixity enchanted the king, whose greediness for business epistles was insatiable. The painstaking monarch toiled, pen in hand, after his wonderful minister, in vain. Philip was only fit to be the bishop's clerk; yet he imagined himself to be the directing and governing power. The bishop gave advice and issued instructions, when he seemed only receiving them. His aptitude for managing men was very great; his capacity for affairs incontestable; but it must always be understood as the capacity for the affairs of absolutism. His industry was enormous. He could write fifty letters a day with his own hand. He could dictate to half a dozen amanuenses at once, on as many different subjects, in as many different languages, and send them away exhausted."

Besides creating the new bishoprics, Philip re-enacted an edict which seems to be levelled against almost every species of liberty that a healthy man deems desirable. The king lifted it up into supremacy over all the other constitutions and guaranties of the provinces, and held it there till his authority expired. Underneath this edict the nation struggled and staggered, naked to all its pitiless blows, unconscious that fidelity to every principle which it disowned was a virtual republic. For look at some of the clauses of this edict, and judge if a practical contradiction of them could be less than the birth of an independent people:—

"No one shall print, write, copy, keep, conceal, sell, buy, or give, in churches, streets, or other places, any book or writing made by Martin Luther, John Œcolampadius, Ulrich Zwinglius, Martin Bucer, John Calvin, or other heretics reprobated by the Holy Church. We forbid all lay persons *to converse or dispute concerning the Holy Scriptures*, openly or secretly, especially on any doubtful or difficult matters, or *to read, teach, or expound the Scriptures*, unless they have duly studied theology and been approved by some renowned university; or to

preach secretly or openly, or to entertain any of the opinions of the above-mentioned heretics, on pain —”

Of what? a heavy fine, — an entire confiscation, — perpetual imprisonment, perpetual exile, the face branded and the ears cropped? Such perturbators who, as Mr. Motley says, were guilty of reading “Christ’s Sermon on the Mount to their children in their own parlor or shop,” are to be executed: “to wit, the men with the sword and the women to be buried alive, if they *do not* persist in their errors; if they do persist in them, then they are to be executed with fire, — all their property in both cases being confiscated to the crown.”

This edict is drawn up with a diabolical ingenuity which exhausts the whole subject and provides for every contingency, in contemptuous forgetfulness of all the constitutional provisions of the people. It is not possible to imagine a more deliberate recognition of the lowest passions of human nature, with an authorized premium upon them, than the other clauses of the edict. Those who neglect to betray the suspected, are liable to the same punishment with them. It was death to “lodge, entertain, furnish with food, fire, or clothing,” any one suspected of being a heretic. Any one thus suspected of heresy, and *therefore condemned* to make public fine or reparation, shall lose life and property if he happen to become suspected again, even if it should turn out that the suspicion was groundless. The clause that aims at educating a class of spies and denouncers is very minute, and plies the breast with the double stimulus of reward and fear. A special bounty was held out to treachery, in the provision, “that, if any man, being present at any secret conventicle, shall afterwards come forward and betray his fellow-members of the congregation, he shall receive full pardon.” And lest the severity of these decrees should inspire the feeling that they were only meant to frighten people into conformity, all persons of whatsoever rank were forbidden “to ask of us, or of any one having authority, *to grant pardon*, or to present any petition in favor of such heretics, exiles, or fugitives, on penalty of being declared for ever incapable of civil or military office, and of being arbitrarily punished besides.”

The Catholic Prince of Orange remonstrated against

the execution of this edict, and resisted it from the beginning; he foresaw all the miseries which actually came upon the provinces from an Inquisition legalized by such decrees and enforced by foreign troops. Not an execution took place which did not cost the government the loyalty of many hearts; the process was tedious, but at length all hearts had become converted. Granvelle went into retirement, to escape from the jealousy of the nobles and from the popular indignation. The remonstrances which the nobles send to the king are answered by fresh injunctions to the authorities to be stringent and implacable. The nobles express their dissatisfaction, in caucuses and at banquets, at the insignificant part which they play in the councils of the Regent. Egmont, Horn, Brederode, and others, form a league, and present to Margaret the famous Request, which recapitulated the state of the country and urged the repeal of the Edicts. It was on this occasion that the confederates earned the soubriquet of "the Beggars"; it designated, long after they had passed away, the partisans of liberty by land and sea, and became the terrible watchword of the people. "There go our fine beggars again," said an ultra-Catholic noble, alluding to Brederode's and Egmont's debts. The luxurious and eccentric Brederode gave a great banquet to inaugurate the league and baptize it with a name. After he had drenched his three hundred guests in liberal cups, he called to one of his pages,

"who brought him a leathern wallet, such as was worn at that day by professional mendicants, together with a large wooden bowl, which also formed part of their regular appurtenances. Brederode immediately hung the wallet around his neck, filled the bowl with wine, lifted it with both hands, and drained it at a draught. 'Long live the beggars!' he cried, as he wiped his beard and set the bowl down. '*Vivent les gueulx!*' Then for the first time, from the lips of those reckless nobles, rose the famous cry, which was so often to ring over land and sea, amid blazing cities, and blood-stained decks, through the smoke and carnage of many a stricken field. The humor of Brederode was hailed with deafening shouts of applause. The Count then threw the wallet around the neck of his nearest neighbor, and handed him the wooden bowl. Each guest, in turn, donned the mendicant's knapsack. Pushing aside his golden goblet, each filled the beggars' bowl to the brim, and drained it to the beggars' health. Roars of laughter, and shouts of '*Vivent les*

gueule!' shook the walls of the stately mansion, as they were doomed never to shake again. The shibboleth was invented. The conjuration which they had been anxiously seeking was found. Their enemies had provided them with a spell which was to prove, in after days, potent enough to start a spirit from palace or hovel, forest or wave, as the deeds of the 'wild beggars,' the 'wood beggars,' and the 'beggars of the sea,' taught Philip at last to understand the nation which he had driven to madness."

Orange was too moderate and politic to associate himself with such a demonstration, and none of those nobles were efficient instruments of his subsequent designs. They and their measures passed lightly away before the slow rolling cloud that was afterwards to overhang and refresh the land.

The field-preachings, the tumults of the Iconoclasts, the operations of the nobles, the skirmishes between the troops and sectaries, decided Philip to make an armed invasion of the Netherlands. The troops destined for this object were put under the command of the Duke of Alva, who would also supersede the Regent Margaret. The redoubtable commander made his appearance upon the scene in the summer of 1567, and after having gained uniform success in all his undertakings, he retired in 1573, baffled in his great object of reducing the Netherland heresy by force of arms. The details of his administration are sanguinary and ferocious beyond belief.

"From the pompous and theatrical scaffolds of Egmont and Horn, to the nineteen halts prepared by Master Karl to hang up the chief bakers and brewers of Brussels on their own thresholds,—from the beheading of the twenty nobles on the Horse-Market, in the opening of the governor's career, to the roasting alive of Nitenhoove at its close,—from the block on which fell the honored head of Anthony Straalen, to the obscure chair in which the ancient gentlewoman of Amsterdam suffered death for an act of mercy,—from one year's end to another's,—from the most signal to the most squalid scenes of sacrifice,—the eye and hand of the great master directed, without weariness, the task imposed by the sovereign."

Some of Mr. Motley's best pages record the Duke's administration. The arrest and execution of Counts Egmont and Horn is a most admirable specimen of dramatic history. Mr. Motley lingers over all such

moments with an unusual copiousness of detail; but it does not fret and retard the breathless interest with which we follow. Less minuteness might demand less art, but then we should not be carried back so completely into the event, and find mere trifles as momentous as the actors did. As an artist and as a sympathizing man, Mr. Motley lives in the epoch which he observes. It is difficult to find a history in which the writer has so thoroughly antedated his own personality, and made it mingle with the citizens till it has become receptive of their love and hate, feels the same rack, and grasps the same sword in helpful enthusiasm. He does not criticise a century; he immerses himself and us in its emotions. He describes, for instance, the bloody assizes of the Inquisition, as a burgher would who yearned to read his Bible and listen to the preached word of God. Titelmann, the Jeffries of the Netherlands, has him under suspicion, and the unpleasant fingers of the familiars may be playing around his throat at any time. Historical impartiality consists in an accurate reproduction of all the human feelings of such a situation. There are two sides to the history of the Catholic Church, but only one side to the history of the Inquisition in the Netherlands. If it were Mr. Motley's object to bring into the field of view all the elements which that Church contained, he would doubtless take us with the Jesuits to Paraguay, to China, and Japan, and his hand would help rear the cross which the devoted bishop carried to the Frisians. He would rekindle fire in the words of St. Bernard, repoint the logic of Aquinas, and gratefully follow the charities of Elizabeth of Hungary. If, under the sign of that Church, faith and devotion have ever advanced truth or protected humanity, Mr. Motley would be the first man on the spot, beckoning us to come and see. But the annals of the Church in Holland commit a man to quite a different task, and we could not respect a writer who did not feel as a free citizen of the country. As soon call a man sectarian who believes in God, as call a lover of freedom of conscience and speech a partisan.

Mr. Motley does not forget to record the occasional outrages which were committed by the Calvinists when they began to predominate. Philip had planted an in-

stitution in the country capable of qualifying all its inhabitants in cruelty. The wonder is that such atrocious imitations were not of daily occurrence, for the people had no time to forget how the faces of their kindred looked in the smoke, nor how the cherished blood lay spilled upon the scaffold. Orange anticipated such seasons of retaliation by the most stringent orders and entreaties, and saved the glory of the people's suffering from being tarnished by revenge.

Mr. Motley also corrects our fanciful ideas of some characters as a man would who was their contemporary. Goethe's *Egmont* and Schiller's *Don Carlos* derive their excellence from the poet's license to magnify historic doubts and mysteries. But when these are resolved by a skilful collation of fresh evidence, *Egmont* is no patriot, and *Don Carlos* is a tyrannical and sensual youth. *Egmont* had expensive tastes and a good deal of egotism. He was a dashing commander of cavalry, and was flattered out of all rational sense of his own importance. He felt slighted because the Regent did not defer to him more in her administration, and he hated Cardinal Granvelle, who made him feel what an empty-headed spendthrift he was. He went to Spain to carry the remonstrance of the nobles, and came back with an infatuation for Philip so complete, that neither Orange's warning nor the ill omens that gathered round him awakened a single suspicion. The only romance about *Egmont* was of the melodramatic kind. Fancy has painted on the sombre canvas of that period the figure of a young noble, jewelled, bearded, high-browed, an idol of the people, in the magnificent attitude of protecting their liberties, and staking the prestige of a great family against arbitrary power. The jewels and the beard are the only properties remaining. Mr. Motley arrays in them a prodigal, half-bankrupt, and vaporing soldier, irresistible in a charge, cutting and graceful in his caricatures of the Cardinal, a hot partisan of noble privileges, but ignorant of the popular necessities, infected with bold sentiments at home, but completely fuddled in half an hour's talk with Philip. When the Duke of Alva came, who bore a grudge against the splendid captain, he rode out to welcome him with all the unconsciousness and self-satisfaction of Malvolio,

and failed to see his scaffold lowering in the Duke's first look. It was fortunate for Holland that such inordinate vanity was thus cut off, for it would have betrayed the noblest cause.

The name of Don Carlos is only once mentioned by the Prince of Orange, "who said in a letter that the 'Prince of Spain had lately eaten sixteen pounds of fruit, including four pounds of grapes, at a single sitting, and had become ill in consequence.' The result was sufficiently natural," continues Mr. Motley, "but it nowhere appears that the royal youth, born to consume the fruits of the earth so largely, had ever given the Netherlanders any other proof of his capacity to govern them. There is no doubt that he was a most uncomfortable personage at home, both to himself and to others, and that he hated his father very cordially." Mr. Motley clears up the mysteries in which the dark policy of the father has enveloped Don Carlos; and a half-witted, malicious, gluttonous, incontinent figure steps out for a momentary recognition, to vanish then for ever, we hope, from poetry as well as from history.

With what microscopic fidelity Mr. Motley reproduces these portraits of persons! They have all the nicety of the new photographs of mediæval architecture, which show every mark of the chisel and the weather. The labor must have been great of studying the contemporaneous memorials, and bringing the character together, bit by bit, into its original proportions. He seems to have the Mussulman's reverence for every scrap of written paper, and to anticipate some value from it. Authorities hitherto unheard of, he has found existing in various recesses; and he appears to know exactly where other documents are that can fill in the canvas with a stroke or two. There is something very insinuating about an American when he goes abroad to write a history. He has access to places which all his foreign predecessors had not penetrated. Archives yield up to him their choicest secrets; librarians and every species of official hasten to make a clean breast of it, as if it were the mission of the American to write the Old World histories, as well as to live a better one. There are no prejudices against his search; he was never implicated in their past diplomacy. He does not come as a Spaniard to blab old secrets about

French policy, nor as an Englishman to verify anti-Gallic enmities and suspicions. His fingers are at the bottom of every pigeon-hole in Europe. They let him dive so deep, apparently, because he has come so far.

But opportunity is nothing without the tact of research. Mr. Motley has this in an eminent degree; he has woven every sound thread into his book. At first we are disposed to quarrel with the patient minuteness that puts us into possession of the history as it was really lived, almost as it were, a day at a time. We like to be taken up by brilliant generalizations that lump a year or two in a paragraph; they bear us along more swiftly between the great points of interest. Readers of modern books have been made impatient; they prefer to take their history boiled down, from great masses of diplomatic and epistolary material, into an epigram. Mr. Motley soon convinces us that he has no intention of tiring us with trifles, but that he has intercepted those innumerable couriers with despatches because they were carrying to and fro the history of Holland; he bids them deliver all that proved to become intrinsic history, and lets the rest escape. But this is a great merit, and the labor must have been prodigious. The effect is, not only to account for and justify every important circumstance, but to give us a personal interest in it, as though we were the contemporaries slowly living towards it. Thus it has the blood of the country in its veins. We would not give up a single page of these eighteen hundred, though doubtless the story might be crushed into a single volume. That would be like the attempt to have a year's life in an hour at the theatre.

During the administration of Requesens, who was Alva's successor, the famous siege and relief of Leyden occurred. Here we think that Mr. Motley snatches his laurels also in describing the firmness of Orange, the devotion of the people, and the glorious rescue conducted by Admiral Boisot. The dikes had been broken through, and under the pressure of a violent northwest wind the waters of the North Sea came sweeping over the cultivated fields to bear the fleet of the deliverers to Leyden. What despairing and exulting human hearts, what wild pictures of midnight battles, what a spectacle to vessels advancing over a submerged country to attack the in-

trenchments of the besiegers! Not a picturesque or sublime trait has escaped Mr. Motley's pen.

"In the course of twenty-four hours, the fleet at North Aa, instead of nine inches, had more than two feet of water. No time was lost. The Kirk-way, which had been broken through according to the Prince's instructions, was now completely overflowed, and the fleet sailed at midnight, in the midst of the storm and darkness. A few sentinel vessels of the enemy challenged them as they steadily rowed towards Zoeterwoude. The answer was a flash from Boisot's cannon, lighting up the black waste of waters. There was a fierce naval midnight battle; a strange spectacle among the branches of those quiet orchards, and with the chimney-stacks of half-submerged farm-houses rising around the contending vessels. The neighboring village of Zoeterwoude shook with the discharges of the Zealanders' cannon, and the Spaniards assembled in that fortress knew that the rebel admiral was at last afloat and on his course. The enemy's vessels were soon sunk, their crews hurled into the waves. On went the fleet, sweeping over the broad waters which lay between Zoeterwoude and Zwieten. As they approached some shallows, which led into the great mere, the Zealanders dashed into the sea, and with sheer strength shouldered every vessel through."

The Spaniards, seized with a panic, abandoned their redoubts, which might possibly have been held against the fleet, and hastened to escape along the only road that was left.

"Their narrow path was rapidly vanishing in the waves, and hundreds sank beneath the constantly deepening and treacherous flood. The wild Zealanders, too, sprang from their vessels upon the crumbling dike, and drove their retreating foes into the sea. They hurled their harpoons at them, with an accuracy acquired in many a polar chase."

But after all, the strongest redoubt occupied by the besiegers was still directly in their way, and the rest of the day was lost in reconnoitring it. The inhabitants of Leyden could see the vessels which had come so far, under circumstances so unexampled, to bring them bread and safety. The suspense was horrible. The citizens who were still capable of bearing arms resolved to make a sortie in the early morning, and draw the Spaniards away from the side on which the vessels lay.

"Night descended upon the scene, a pitch-dark night, full of anxiety to the Spaniards, to the armada, to Leyden. Strange

sights and sounds occurred at different moments to bewilder the anxious sentinels. A long procession of lights issuing from the fort was seen to flit across the black face of the waters, in the dead of night, and the whole of the city wall, between the Cowgate and the Tower of Burgundy, fell with a loud crash. The horror-struck citizens thought that the Spaniards were upon them at last; the Spaniards imagined the noise to indicate a desperate sortie of the citizens. Everything was vague and mysterious. Day dawned at length, after the feverish night, and the admiral prepared for the assault. Within the fortress reigned a death-like stillness, which inspired a sickening suspicion. Had the city, indeed, been carried in the night? had the massacre already commenced? had all this labor and audacity been expended in vain? Suddenly a man was descried wading breast-high through the water from Lammen towards the fleet, while at the same time one solitary boy was seen to wave his cap from the summit of the fort. After a moment of doubt, the happy mystery was solved. The Spaniards had fled, panic-struck, during the darkness."

We have no room to transfer to our pages the rest of Mr. Motley's description, including the scene as the well-provisioned fleet rowed into the canals of the city, the thanks to God, and the effect of the news to rouse the drooping spirits of Orange. The eyewitnesses who undertook to chronicle those glorious days have waited till now for their materials to receive flowing life, and to have the landscape thronging with forms of flesh and blood.

Mr. Motley brings his history down to the assassination of the Prince of Orange, and we do not see the actual establishment of the Dutch Republic. The Flemish provinces soon fell away from a league that was never substantial and hearty. The Celts of Flanders continued Catholic, and were compelled to become loyal by the successes of Parma, who was Philip's fifth governor. The Germans of Holland and Zealand united into sovereign and independent states, immediately after the death of Orange. May we not expect that Mr. Motley, stimulated by the great success he has achieved, will apply his fine spirit of research, his love of liberty, and his picturesque pen, to an exhibition of the commonwealth, and give us Barneveldt as he has given Orange? We desire to see more of those Vandyke portraits conjured from their frames, and flushing with

the passions of old days. We should like to know the truth about many an interesting character which has not yet found a humane, liberty-loving, and intelligent delineator. Splendid periods in the history of Holland yet remain undeveloped; great achievements by sea and land are known as facts bare of almost everything except their dates. It is but proper that one who occupies a place in the front rank of American historians should continue the history of Liberty, and show us how she bore the prosperity which she inherited from suffering. On such an undertaking, a pen so clear, so warm, and so humane cannot help finding new lessons for our guidance, as it has already refreshed our faith in the ideas and rights which dark hours have obscured. The History of the Dutch Republic is a great gift to us; but the heart and earnestness that beat through all its pages are greater; for they give us most timely inspiration to vindicate the true ideas of our country, and to compose a noble history of our own.

J. W.

ART. VII. — GOVERNOR BRADFORD'S HISTORY OF PLYMOUTH PLANTATION.*

THERE have been many literal fulfilments of a very remarkable and happy character, as regards historical facts and documents, of the promise that "there is nothing hid that shall not be known." True, there is still a long list of lost treasures, comprehending works in every department of literature, the fate of some of which we know, and of others of which we fear that they have been hopelessly snatched from our use. Fire has been the chief agent in destroying the treasured manuscripts which would have been invaluable to the publishers of this age of countless readers. Many of us may join in the lament of Ben Jonson over the burning of his History of Henry the Fifth, as, in his "Execration on Vul-

* *History of Plymouth Plantation.* By WILLIAM BRADFORD, the second Governor of the Colony. Now first printed from the Original Manuscript. Boston: Published for the Massachusetts Historical Society. 1856. 8vo. pp. xx., 476.

can," he tells us what noble fellow-laborers he had in the composition of his work:—

"Therein was oil, besides the succors spent,
Which noble Carew, Cotton, Selden, sent."

Perhaps, however, our known losses have been compensated by the unexpected discovery, from time to time, of works of whose existence we had no knowledge, and by the occasional restoration of treasures that had long been regarded as destroyed. Past experience has taught us that there are still, and always will be, hidden materials enough in existence to render probable, and even necessary, the rewriting of all important histories at successive intervals short of the term of centuries.

It was well known that the most distinguished of the governors of the old Plymouth Colony, like the honored Winthrop of the Bay, had not only intended, but completed, an historical journal, covering nearly the whole period of the years spent by him on this soil. No more impressive token could be offered of the deeply cherished conviction in the hearts of both these excellent men, that they were engaged in a work for all time,—a work of whose beginnings posterity would gratefully cherish the memorials,—than the fidelity with which they committed to record the incidents of the day of small things. Equally remarkable, too, are the modesty, the humility, and the dignified reserve of both of them, in making their office of annalists of dark or hopeful incidents superior to any personal objects of their own. It is utterly impossible to gather biographical materials concerning themselves from their writings. Indeed, it would be difficult to prove, by any direct evidence unassailable by the modern sceptical tests, that Winthrop and Bradford wrote their respective Histories. When we learn, too, from other sources, that each of them had rivals in their magistracy, and were occasionally subject to hasty and ill-advised reproach, and met with some sharp issues raised by their own independence and fidelity, we may justly pronounce their reserve touching their personal affairs a high and peculiar exhibition of magnanimity. These noble qualities of Winthrop had long been manifest to the readers of our history. The recovery of Bradford's history proves his full title to them.

It is proper that we should give some account of the manner in which this long-lost treasure was brought to the light. Secretary Morton, nephew of Governor Bradford, Governor Hutchinson, our historian, and the Rev. Thomas Prince, of the Old South Church, Boston, our annalist, had used the manuscript of the Plymouth Governor in compiling their respective works. Had Prince been content to take for granted the creation and the flood, and a few more of the remote antiquities of the world; he would have saved himself time for bringing down his own Annals to a period nearer to that of his death, which occurred in 1758, a century after the death of Bradford. The rich materials in print and in precious manuscripts which he had gathered and deposited in the tower of the Old South Church are said to have furnished the means of lighting the fire in the stove, when that edifice was desecrated, by the British soldiery in our Revolution, with a riding-school on its floor and a dram-shop in one of its galleries. A portion of the books which were rescued are in the library of that parish, and the remainder are committed to the keeping of the Massachusetts Historical Society. Prince brought down his digest of our Annals from Bradford, Winthrop, and other sources, to August, 1633. Governor Hutchinson, the second volume of whose History was published in 1767, gives from Bradford's manuscript "A Summary of the Affairs" of Plymouth Colony; and here was the last mention made by any of our writers of a work which we had regarded as destroyed. Besides his History, Governor Bradford left a "Letter Book," which, from the brief portions of it that he had transferred to his History, and from the fragment of it which has been most strangely rescued from a mean use, we may safely say, would have been invaluable to us. This fragment was found in a grocer's shop in Halifax, and occupies some fifty pages in the third volume of the Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society. It may be idle to speculate upon the agencies or the methods of the fate which befell these manuscripts of Bradford. It is pretty certain, however, that that fate turned upon the events of our Revolutionary War, and the only reason — by the way, a very cogent one — for concerning ourselves with the matter is, that we might be led to search after more

such treasures. These manuscripts may have been either in the possession of Governor Hutchinson, when, at the sack of his house in the north end of this city, his papers were scattered by a mob of his indignant townsmen, or they may have been in the tower of the Old South Church. In either case their value might have been known to some Tory, or to some British officer. A Tory would naturally have carried them to Halifax, while an officer of the army would have taken them to London,—the two places having proved to be respectively the localities in which the Letter Book and the History were discovered. We should incline to the opinion, that Hutchinson had both the manuscripts with him at his house in Milton, from which he fled with some of his effects, and the only misgiving we should feel about this supposition would be, that in that case we should have looked to hear of the manuscripts as in the possession of his grandson in England, with the other family papers.

Some portions of Bradford's History, coming down to 1620 only, had been copied into the Plymouth Church Records by Secretary Morton, and had been published, for the most part, as if from his authorship, by Mr. Hazard. The late Rev. Dr. Young incorporated all these extracts by Morton, and added valuable annotations to them, in his "Chronicles of the Pilgrims," published in 1841.

We will now make a very interesting quotation from the Editorial Preface of the work before us, that we may fulfil a grateful duty to a gentleman whose zeal and pains and fidelity to his task have justly entitled him to have his name associated with Bradford's History. The editor of the volume, and the writer of the modest but most valuable Preface to it, is Mr. Charles Deane, of Boston, Chairman of the Committee of Publication of the thirty-third volume of the Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, who hardly knew what a responsible and exacting service would be required of him when appointed to that trust. Mr. Deane says:—

"On the 17th day of February, 1855, the Rev. John S. Barry, who was at that time engaged in writing the first volume of his History of Massachusetts, since published, called upon me, and stated that he believed he had made an important dis-

covery ; it being no less than Governor Bradford's manuscript History. He then took from his pocket a duodecimo volume, entitled 'A History of the Protestant Episcopal Church in America, by Samuel, Lord Bishop of Oxford. Second edition. London, 1846,' — which a few days before had been lent to him by a friend, — and pointed out certain passages in the text, which any one familiar with them would at once recognize as the language of Bradford, as cited by Morton and Prince ; but which the author of the volume, in his foot-notes, referred to a 'MS. History of the Plantation of Plymouth, &c., in the Fulham Library.' There were other passages in the volume, not recognized as having before been printed, which were referred to the same source. I fully concurred with Mr. Barry in the opinion that this Fulham manuscript could be no other than Bradford's History, either the original or a copy, — the whole or a part ; and that measures should at once be taken to cause an examination of it to be made." — *Preface*, p. v.

Mr. Deane immediately addressed a letter to his correspondent, the Rev. Joseph Hunter, one of the Vice-Presidents of the Society of Antiquaries of London, and a corresponding member of the Massachusetts Historical Society, calling his attention to the extracts and the reference made by the Bishop of Oxford, and asking him to examine the Fulham manuscript, with a view to having it copied if it should prove to be Bradford's. An original letter of Bradford's was enclosed by Mr. Deane, as a test of the handwriting. Mr. Hunter — who, in his "Founders of New Plymouth," in his persevering investigations connected with our early colonists, and in his ready attention to the numerous epistles of inquiry addressed to him from this country, has shown his own zeal in our behalf — was the very best person that could have been applied to on this occasion, and he entered heartily upon the commission. Fulham is a village four miles from Hyde-Park Corner. Its manor has belonged to the see of London for nearly a thousand years, and contains a very valuable library. The Bishop of Oxford, on the application made to him by Mr. Hunter, kindly promised to convey his message and request to the Bishop of London, and the result proved that the Fulham manuscript was the long-lost History by Bradford. At the risk of appearing somewhat ungracious, we will venture the remark, that it would have been quite a handsome thing had the offer of a present

of the manuscript been made to our Historical Society. Seeing that the volume bears on its cover to this day the book-plate of the "New England Library," which library has a legal successor and heir in this good city, and that it was (shall we write the word?) stolen!—beyond all question unlawfully purloined and carried off,—seeing also that it is hardly becoming in a bishop to keep that sort of property, except for safe keeping, that it may be restored to its rightful owners,—we will allow what we have written to stand. But we must acknowledge the courtesy of the Bishop of London in at once putting the volume into the hands of Mr. Hunter, to take home with him and to keep for an unlimited time, that it might be copied for our use. We must also acknowledge our indebtedness to Mr. Hunter for his own hearty and laborious response to the favor asked of him in procuring an accomplished transcriber of the manuscript, in overseeing his work, in collating and verifying the transcript, in obtaining a fac-simile of a page, and in co-operating with Mr. Deane through the whole progress of the transaction. To Mr. Deane we are under larger obligations. He directed that the transcript should be made by a complete imitation of the original, and he has so given it to us, allowing the antiquated record to appear in typography as it came from the pen of the honored Governor. He has also prepared a body of very necessary and useful notes, remarkable alike for conciseness, accuracy, and good taste. Letters from him have crossed the ocean in large number, for the purpose of assuring faultless exactness in the transcript. We may feel quite sure that with Mr. Hunter and Mr. Deane as scrutinizers of every step in the progress of the undertaking, it is submitted to us in a perfectly reliable form. This painstaking devotion has no other reward than that which a true lover of the memories and virtues of good men finds in renewing the memorials of them and of their services. After the copy had been received in this country, Mr. Deane devoted himself to the preparation of the proper notes, and then supervised its publication at the University Press, in Cambridge, where he found willing coadjutors in securing the elegant imprint now before us. The Historical Society passed an especial vote of thanks to the editor for his highly appreciated services.

We are indebted chiefly to Cotton Mather among the ancients, and to the recent researches of Mr. Hunter, for our knowledge of the incidents of Bradford's personal history before he came to this continent. The record of his birth, on March 19, 1589-90, is found on the register of Austerfield, a hamlet in Yorkshire, near Scrooby, the residence of Elder Brewster, and the place where Robinson's Puritan Church was gathered. Bradford, being left an orphan in his early years, received a small inheritance from honest parents, which enabled him to elevate a life apparently destined for husbandry by some attainments in the rudiments of good learning. His earnest mind led him on to some "skill in diverse tongues," and he attained considerable proficiency in after life in French, Latin, and Greek. His residence in Holland made him a master of the Dutch language. Within the covers of the autograph volume, though forming no part of the history, as Mr. Hunter writes to Mr. Deane, there "is a rather long piece, being Hebrew roots with English explanations." There are eight pages of these exercises, including extracts from the Hebrew Scriptures, in the handwriting of Governor Bradford. Prefixed to them is the following note of the good man, which for the touching sweetness of its tone, and the grateful strain of its piety, is a gem of literature. The pen that wrote it must have been dipped in the dew of Mount Hermon.

"Though I am growne aged, yet I have had a longing desire to see, with my owne eyes, somthing of that most ancient language, and holy tongue, in which the Law and oracles of God were write; and in which God, and angels, spake to the holy patriarks of old time; and what names were given to things, from the creation. And though I cannot attaine to much herein, yet I am refreshed to have seen some glimpse hereof (as Moyses saw the land of Canan a farr off). My aime and desire is, to see how the words and phrases lye in the holy texte; and to discerne somewhat of the same, for my owne contente."—*Preface*, p. xiv.

He imbibed his Puritan sentiments from the ministry of Mr. Richard Clifton, and having received the then despised and obnoxious religion of a godly people, he faithfully cherished it in spite of the wrath of his relatives and the scoffs of his neighbors. He withdrew from

the English communion, and joined that of the outlawed Separatists. His church removed to Holland when he was about eighteen years of age. He was one of those who were arrested by the "chatch poule officers," and imprisoned in Boston, Lincolnshire, on the failure of the first attempt of the persecuted flock to get away into Holland. He was afterwards arrested in Holland as a fugitive from England, but secured his liberty. During the transient sojourn of the church at Amsterdam, he served "a Frenchman at the working of silks." On the removal to Leyden, he converted his little patrimony in England into money, and set up for himself. We find in his history the following record of his election to the chief magistracy of the little wilderness colony soon after its settlement at Plymouth. It was at a dark time in their fortunes, as half of the company were then resting beneath their rude graves, and most of the living were stricken with severe weaknesses and diseases. Governor Carver's government was a short one, extending only from the cabin of the Mayflower on its arrival to the spring of the first year of the settlement. He left no descendants. The date is 1621.

"In this month of *Aprill* whilst they were bussie about their seed, their Gov^r (M^r. John Carver) came out of y^e feild very sick, it being a hott day; he complained greatly of his head, and lay downe, and within a few howers his sences failed, so as he never spake more till he dyed, which was within a few days after. Whoss death was much lamented, and caused great heavines amongst them, as ther was cause. He was buried in y^e best maner they could, with some vollies of shott by all that bore armes; and his wife, being a weak woman, dyed within 5. or 6. weeks after him.

"Shortly after William Bradford was chosen Gove^r in his stead, and being not yet recoverd of his ilnes, in which he had been near y^e point of death, Isaak Allerton was chosen to be an Asistente unto him, who, by renewed election every year, continued sundry years togeather, which I hear note once for all." — pp. 100, 101.

Mr. Bradford was annually re-elected to his very responsible office up to his death, May 9, 1657, with the exception of only five years, when slight jealousies and colonial "politics" relieved him.

The man, the magistrate, and the Christian, appears
VOL. LX. — 4TH S. VOL. XXVI. NO. I. 12

to us in his own pages as the historian of other men's doings and experiences, and of what Heaven destined for the beginning of a noble work. He has nothing to say of himself, save as the reader infers his own agency, and notes on every page the occasion for the exercise of great virtues in all who shared the perils and straits of a forlorn enterprise, and the need of especial graces of soul in their trusted chief ruler. Bradford impresses us most deeply and most tenderly, as one of the noblest of men. He was great in his goodness, eminent in his practical wisdom, honorable in his large exercise of magnanimity, forbearance, patience, and gentleness under many exacting trials, and venerable for the calm fervor and constancy of his piety. We take him with the honored Winthrop to our hearts, and enshrine the two in our admiring regard and love. They were much alike in the high qualities of their souls, in native dignity, in spotless purity, in habitual self-control, in generosity, and in the elements and the strength of their Christian faith. They both encountered rivalries and jealousies in their magistracies, and both met them with discretion, meekness, and a spirit wholly forgetful of all private ends, aiming only for the public good. They had both to maintain their own personal rights against envious and disorderly men, but they did so in a passionless and Christian temper which utterly confounded their opponents, and won them such esteem as ever afterwards was to them more than a body-guard, more than all the pomp of courtly ceremonial, as they presided over their rude wilderness courts in the garb of husbandmen. They both have to relate offensive and disgusting particulars, as the deeds of "inordinate and unsavory persons," who found their way through the defences of their Christian commonwealths; but these iniquities are recorded by them in a way which shows that their own pure thoughts were unsullied, and that the monstrosity of foul sin was to them but a new restraint to the sanctity of holy virtue. Both these worshipful Christian magistrates embarked their all of worldly wealth, hope, and prospects, and pledged their confidence in the heavenly inheritance, and spent the years of their mature lives, in the humble toils connected with the first settlement of the most inhospitable regions

of the New World. Neither of them once looked back. Neither of them seems even to have entertained a wish to revisit the land of their birth. There is a sweet fragrance of piety about their memories. They need no apologists for anything they said, wrote, or did. One who should undertake to vindicate them in their policy, their peculiarities, or their consistency, would only prove that he started with some misconception or ignorance on his own part, which would utterly disqualify him as their champion. Bradford and Winthrop saw the good hand of God in the work to which they gave themselves with such singleness and heroism of soul. Let us recognize the same Divine Providence in its instruments. That heart is outside of the influences of any common or peculiar power to move all human sympathies, which can put itself into communion with Bradford and Winthrop through their pages, and not feel the glow of an admiring love, or yield the homage due to rare excellence and lofty piety.

Bradford began to write his History in 1630, ten years after his arrival with the first-comers at Plymouth; the last entry in it made by him was in 1650, seven years before his death. As already intimated, he gathered a mass of letters which he preserved for historical use. Some of these he has incorporated at length, and others by extracts, or in substance, in these pages. He begins by a brief sketch of the introduction and working of Puritan principles in England, when the minds of some sincere and pious persons were learning to exercise that soul-freedom which they had learned from the Bible was alike their gift from God and the root of their accountability to him. What a pregnant sentence was that for earnest and believing men and women to read in the pages of the unsealed, unclasped English Bible, in which the Apostle tells disciples that Christ has made them all "to be KINGS and PRIESTS unto God," thus committing to each disciple the two most august prerogatives of temporal and spiritual dominion, centring in each soul a royal and a priestly sway, making each to be his own monarch and his own sacrificer! Bradford tells us how truths of that depth and compass wrought in souls that felt their power. He sketches the origin of the two Puritan churches in the North of

England,— Mr. Smith's, which was afterwards scattered in the Low Countries, and Mr. Clifton's, which, under the subsequent ministry of the noble Robinson, was the mother of our New England churches. The historian relates, with a subdued pathos, the hard buffetings of the flight into Holland,— the first attempt in which was unsuccessful, and the second of which barely failed of the darkest catastrophe.

Their residence in Amsterdam was brief, being but "about a year." A fear of being involved in the contentions between Smith's church and that of which Johnson and Ainsworth were pastor and teacher, suggested a removal to some other place in Holland. We will make an extract from Bradford, at this point, for the sake of copying his beautiful tribute to Robinson :—

"For these & some other reasons they removed to Leyden, a fair & bewtifull citie, and of a sweete situation, but made more famous by y^e universitie wherwith it is adorned, in which of late had been so many learned men. But wanting that traffike by sea which Amsterdam injoyes, it was not so beneficiall for their outward means of living & estats. But being now hear pitchet they fell to such trades & imployments as they best could ; val-ewing peace & their spirituall comforte above any other riches whatsoever. And at lenght they came to raise a competente & comfortable living, but with hard and continuall labor.

"Being thus settled (after many difficulties) they continued many years in a comfortable condition, injoying much sweete & delightefull societie & spirituall comforte togeather in y^e wayes of God, under y^e able ministrie, and prudente governmente of M^r. John Robinson, & M^r. William Brewster, who was an assist-ante unto him in y^e place of an Elder, unto which he was now called & chosen by the church. So as they grew in knowl-edge & other gifts & graces of y^e spirite of God, & lived togeather in peace, & love, and holines ; and many came unto them from diverse parts of England, so as they grew a great congregation. And if at any time any differences arose, or of-fences broak out (as it cannot be, but some time ther will, even amongst y^e best of men) they were ever so mete with, and nipt in y^e head betims, or otherwise so well composed, as still love, peace, and communion was continued ; or els y^e church purged of those that were incurable & incorrigible, when, after much patience used, no other means would serve, which seldom came to pass. Yea such was y^e mutuall love, & reciprocall respecte that this worthy man had to his flocke, and his flocke to him, that it might be said of them as it once was of y^e famouse

Emperour Marcus Aurelious, and y^e people of Rome, that it was hard to judge wheather he delighted more in haveing shuch a people, or they in haveing such a pastor. His love was greate towards them, and his care was all ways bente for their best good, both for soule and body ; for besides his singuler abilities in devine things (wherin he excelled), he was also very able to give directions in civill affaires, and to foresee dangers & inconveniences ; by w^{ch} means he was very helpfull to their outward estats, & so was every way as a commone father unto them. And none did more offend him then those that were close and cleaving to them selves, and retired from y^e commoe good ; as also such as would be stiffe & rigned in matters of outward order, and invey against y^e evils of others, and yet be remisse in them selves, and not so carefull to express a vertuous conversation. They in like maner had ever a reverente regard unto him, & had him in precious estimation, as his worth & wisdom did deserve ; and though they esteemed him highly whilst he lived & laboured amongst them, yet much more after his death, when they came to feele y^e wante of his help, and saw (by woefull experience) what a treasure they had lost, to y^e greefe of their harts, and wounding of their sowls ; yea such a loss as they saw could not be repaired ; for it was as hard for them to find such another leader and feeder in all respects, as for y^e Taborits to find another Ziska. And though they did not call themselves orphans, as the other did, after his death, yet they had cause as much to lamente, in another regard, their present condition, and after usage. But to returne ; I know not but it may be spoken to y^e honour of God, & without prejudice to any, that such was y^e true pietie, y^e humble zeale, & fervent love, of this people (whilst they thus lived together) towards God and his waies, and y^e single hartedness & sinceir affection one towards another, that they came as near y^e primative patterne of y^e first churches, as any other church of these later times have done, according to their ranke & qualitie." — pp. 17 – 19.

The historian then gives us a very particular narration of all the stages and reasons connected with the enterprise of an exile beyond the sea, to plant on this continent. We are let into the councils of those steadfast but prudently deliberate men, who shrunk from no sacrifice, but whose faith included the sage conviction that one way in which God helped men was in blessing their use of all their own resources of forethought, discretion, and calculation. No enterprise ever projected by men would seem to have engaged a more just regard to temporal and spiritual considerations, while the temporal,

though subordinated always to the spiritual, received the attention which barely sufficed to save the bold and venturesome undertaking from absolute failure. In the thoroughly honest and candid rehearsal of all the deliberations, misgivings, and frequent disappointments involved in the preliminary negotiations in Holland and England, and of the discomfitures attendant upon the actual commencement of the voyage, the honored Governor seems to open the very hearts of his associates to our study. So true and single was his own spirit, that he cannot wholly repress severity of judgment in dealing with some who fell away, and his honest rebuke and censure of the few who in England, and afterward here, mingled selfish ends or embittering strifes with the common undertaking, will be acknowledged by his readers to have been richly deserved.

There is a real eloquence on many of the pages which record so quaintly, but so touchingly, the straits and trials of the colonists, when, at the close of their tedious voyage, and actually destitute of the necessities of life, they wore through the first year of their exile. More than once starvation stared them in the face. The terms of their association, through a joint stock furnished by "adventurers," only a part of whom came hither, entailed upon them infinite perplexity. They were soon compelled to discriminate between the labors which were to be "*in perticuler*," and those which were to go into "*the general*." The Governor is led into some searching processes here, followed by some painful disclosures as to characters over whom there was a cloud, the full reason for which was till now unknown to the readers of our history. Mr. Cushman clears up his character, for the most part; but Mr. Isaac Allerton passes into a deep shadow.

These pages will effectually settle all doubts as to the justice of the imputations which have heretofore rested upon the fame of the Rev. John Lyford, the Episcopal intruder, and Mr. John Oldham. The former especially makes a sad figure, as drawn by the honest yet forbearing Governor.

We must indulge ourselves in one more extract, for the sake of transferring to our pages his exquisitely touching and affectionate delineation of Elder Brewster. It is under the date of 1643.

“ I am to beginne this year whith that which was a mater of great saddnes and moūring unto them all. About y^e 18. of Aprill dyed their Reve^d Elder, and my dear & loving friend, M^r. William Brewster ; a man that had done and suffered much for y^e Lord Jesus and y^e gospels sake, and had bore his parte in well and woe with this poore persecuted church above 36. years in England, Holand, and in this wildernes, and done y^e Lord & them faithfull service in his place & calling. And notwithstanding y^e many troubles and sorrows he passed throw, the Lord upheld him to a great age. He was nere fourscore years of age (if not all out) when he dyed. He had this blesing added by y^e Lord to all y^e rest, to dye in his bed, in peace, amongst y^e mids of his freinds, who mourned & wepte over him, and ministered what help & comforte they could unto him, and he againe recomforted them whilst he could. His sicknes was not long, and till y^e last day therof he did not wholly keepe his bed. His speech continued till somewhat more than halfe a day, & then failed him ; and aboute 9. or 10. a clock that evīg he dyed, without any pangs at all. A few howers before, he drew his breath shorte, and some few minuts before his last, he drew his breath long, as a man falen into a sound slepe, without any pangs or gaspings, and so sweetly departed this life unto a better.

“ I should say something of his life, if to say a litle were not worse then to be silent. But I cannot wholly forbear, though hapily more may be done hereafter. After he had attained some learning, viz. y^e knowledg of y^e Latine tongue, & some insight in y^e Greeke, and spent some small time at Cambridge, and then being first seasoned with y^e seeds of grace and vertue, he went to y^e Courte, and served that religious and godly gentlman, M^r. Davison, diverce years, when he was Secretary of State ; who found him so discreete and faithfull as he trusted him above all other that were aboute him, and only imployed him in all matters of greatest trust and secrecie. He esteemed him rather as a sonne then a servante, and for his wisdom & godlines (in private) he would converse with him more like a freind & familier then a maister. He attended his m^r. when he was sente in ambassage by the Queene into y^e Low-Countries, in y^e Earle of Leicesters time, as for other waighty affaires of state, so to receive possession of the cautionary townes, and in token & signe therof the keyes of Flushing being delivered to him, in her ma^{ty}s name, he kepte them some time, and comitted them to this his servante, who kept them under his pilow, on which he slepte y^e first night. And, at his returne, y^e States honoured him with a gould chaine, and his maister comitted it to him, and comanded him to wear it when they arrived in England, as they ridd thorow the country, till they came to y^e Courte. He afterwards remained with

him till his troubles, that he was put from his place aboute y^e death of y^e Queene of Scots ; and some good time after, doeing him manie faithfull offices of servise in y^e time of his troubles. Afterwards he wente and lived in y^e country, in good esteeme amongst his freinds and y^e gentle-men of those parts, espetially the godly & religious. He did much good in y^e countrie wher he lived, in promoting and furthering religion, not only by his practiss & example, and provocking and encouraging of others, but by procuring of good preachers to y^e places therabout, and drawing on of others to assiste & help forward in such a worke ; he him selfe most comonly deepest in y^e charge, & some times above his abillitie. And in this state he continued many years, doeing y^e best good he could, and walking according to y^e light he saw, till y^e Lord reveiled further unto him. And in y^e end, by y^e turrany of y^e bishops against godly preachers & people, in silenceing the one & persecuting y^e other, he and many more of those times begane to looke further into things, and to see into y^e unlawfullnes of their callings, and y^e burthen of many anti-christian corruptions, which both he and they endeavored to cast of ; as y^e allso did, as in y^e beginning of this treatis is to be seene. After they were joyned together in comunion, he was a spetiall stay & help unto them. They ordinarily mett at his house on y^e Lords day, (which was a manor of y^e bishops,) and with great love he entertained them when they came, making provision for them to his great charge. He was y^e cheefe of those that were taken at Boston, and suffered y^e greatest loss ; and of y^e seven that were kept longst in prison, and after bound over to y^e assises. After he came into Holland he suffered much hardship, after he had spent y^e most of his means, having a great charge, and many children ; and, in regard to his former breeding & course of life, not so fitt for many employments as others were, espetially such as were toylesume & laborious. But yet he ever bore his condition with much cherrfullnes and contentation. Towards y^e later parte of those 12. years spent in Holland, his outward condition was mended, and he lived well & plentifully ; for he fell into a way (by reason he had y^e Latine tongue) to teach many students, who had a disire to lerne y^e English tongue, to teach them English ; and by his method they quickly attained it with great facilitie ; for he drew rules to lerne it by, after y^e Latine maner ; and many gentlemen, both Danes & Germans, resorted to him, as they had time from other studies, some of them being great mens soñes. He also had means to set up printing, (by y^e help of some freinds,) and so had employmente inough, and by reason of many books which would not be alowed to be printed in England, they might have had more then they could doe. But now removeing into

this countrie, all these things were laid aside againe, and a new course of living must be framed unto; in which he was no way unwilling to take his parte, and to bear his burthen with y^e rest, living many times without bread, or corne, many months together, having many times nothing but fish, and often wanting that also; and drunke nothing but water for many years togeather, yea, till within 5. or 6. years of his death. And yet he lived (by y^e blessing of God) in health till very old age. And besides y^t, he would labour with his hands in y^e feilds as long as he was able; yet when the church had no other minister, he taught twice every Saboth, and y^t both powerfully and profitably, to y^e great contentment of y^e hearers, and their comfortable edification; yea, many were brought to God by his ministrie. He did more in this behalfe in a year, then many that have their hundreds a year doe in all their lives. For his personall abilities, he was qualified above many; he was wise and discreete and well spoken, having a grave & deliberate utterance, of a very cherfull spirite, very sociable & pleasante amongst his freinds, of an humble and modest mind, of a peaceable disposition, under vallewing him self & his owne abilities, and some time over valewing others; inoffensive and inoçente in his life & conversation, w^{ch} gained him y^e love of those without, as well as those within; yet he would tell them plainly of their faults & evils, both publickly and privatly, but in such a maner as usually was well taken from him. He was tender harted, and compassionate of such as were in miserie, but espetially of such as had been of good estate and ranke, and were fallen unto want & poverty, either for goodnes & religions sake, or by y^e injury & oppression of others; he would say, of all men these deserved to be pitied most. And none did more offend & displease him then such as would hautilly and proudly carry & lift up themselves, being rise from nothing, and having little els in them to comend them but a few fine cloaths, or a litle riches more then others. In teaching, he was very moving & stirring of affections, also very plaine & distincte in what he taught; by which means he became y^e more profitable to y^e hearers. He had a singuler good gift in prayer, both publick and private, in ripping up y^e hart & conscience before God, in y^e humble confession of sinne, and begging y^e mercies of God in Christ for y^e pardon of y^e same. He always thought it were better for ministers to pray oftener, and devide their prears, then be longe & tedious in y^e same (excepte upon sollemne & spetiall occations, as in days of humiliation & y^e like). His reason was, that y^e harte & spirits of all, espetially y^e weake, could hardly continue & stand bente (as it were) so long towards God, as they ought to doe in y^t duty, without flagging and fall-

ing of. For y^e govermente of y^e church, (which was most proper to his office,) he was carfull to preserve good order in y^e same, and to preserve puritie, both in y^e doctrine & comunion of y^e same; and to supress any errour or contention that might begine to rise up amongst them; and accordingly God gave good success to his indeavors herein all his days, and he saw y^e fruite of his labours in that behalfe. But I must breake of, having only thus touched a few, as it were, heads of things."— pp. 408–414.

The good Governor records the merciful providence of God, as exhibited in the longevity of many of the colonists, and evidently regarded the facts which he relates under this head as an equivalent to all the disasters of hardship and mortality which were visited upon the first year of the settlement. He gives us, what we have now for the first time, a perfectly accurate list of the original pilgrims, their families and servants, with brief memorials of some of them. We cannot close these remarks without another expression of our obligations to all who have been concerned in the restoration and publication of this precious work.

G. E. E.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

History and Repository of Pulpit Eloquence (Deceased Divines), containing the Masterpieces of Bossuet, Bourdaloue, Massillon, &c., &c., with Discourses from Chrysostom, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Augustine, Athanasius, &c., &c. Also Sixty other Celebrated Sermons, from as many eminent Divines in the Greek and Latin, English, German, Irish, French, Scottish, American, and Welsh Churches, a large number of which have now for the first time been translated. The whole arranged in their proper Order, and accompanied with Historical Sketches of Preaching in the different Countries represented, and Biographical and Critical Notices of the Several Preachers and their Discourses. By Rev. HENRY C. FISH, Author of Premium Essay, "Primitive Piety Revived." New York: M. W. Dodd. 1856. 2 vols. 8vo. pp. 613, 616.

LARGE as the title-page may seem even as it stands here, we

have not transcribed the whole of it, for we have been obliged to omit the names of most of the preachers whose sermons are contained in this collection of pulpit discourses. It is a very full compilation, and includes excellent specimens from the more or less famous preachers whose words were with power. On many accounts it is a very attractive and valuable work, and throws much light upon the mystery of preaching. Aside from the sketches of the pulpits of different lands and ages, and the brief notices of the various sermonizers whose discourses are presented to the reader, the sermons themselves form a sort of history of pulpit oratory, showing in the best possible way, that is by actual examples, just what it has been in different ages of the Church, from the times of the Fathers to the present day. Some of the discourses, indeed we may say the most of them, belong as much to all lands and all ages as to the country and time which supplied for them place and date; and this is what we should have looked for, inasmuch as there are staples of Christian preaching, permanent lessons, and ever recurring illustrations of Gospel warning and encouragement. These sermons are so many virtual reiterations of the statement that Christian Truth is but one, and that practically there is such a thing as church unity. On the other hand, there are discourses which are filled with the spirit of their times, earnest discussions of the doctrine or practice that then occupied the thoughts of Christians, and engaged them in controversies sadly bitter and unchristian for the most part. The staple discourses, though from men who were justly reckoned "somewhat," are many of them rather dull reading, proving, we think, partly that sermons should rather be listened to than read, and partly that very fresh impulses, an ever new coming of the Spirit, and hearts open wide to receive the divine grace, are needed to make much discoursing profitable. The unprejudiced reader, who can go behind a great name, will not always find in the discourse all that the preface to it heralds, but only very carefully stated commonplaces of doctrine and morality, which would empty a modern church in a single season, — *season*, we say, for it begins to be necessary to apply this word to the services of the Lord's day as well as to the opera and drama. A much more interesting collection of sermons might of course have been made by selecting from a smaller number of authors. South and Taylor, for example, are rich in material compared with which many of these discourses are exceedingly ordinary; but this would not have answered the purpose of the compilation, — this would not have set forth the varying ministry of the Word. Moreover, if the modern reader finds that even "masterpieces" are sometimes dull, he will be all the more tolerant of the living pulpit, and will not give in to

the fancy, that all good preaching ceased with the Fathers. It would require a very "golden mouth" to create a sensation with the sermon of Chrysostom given us in this volume, were it to be pronounced in our day, and most of the other discourses would be voted very tedious by the hearers who magnify brevity beyond every other feature of a homily. There are not many of these sermons that would leave the worshippers much chance of "going to the post-office" after service, and the whole volume would be a practical refutation of a remark which, as we remember, was hazarded once by an enthusiastic advocate of brevity as the one thing needful, to the effect that all the great preachers of the past confined themselves within the smallest possible limits. South was mentioned as a name in point! One of the ablest of this collection of discourses, to our thinking, is part of a double sermon by Luther on his favorite topic, Justification by Faith; and with our conviction that the great reformer had pushed this doctrine to an objectionable extreme, we were amazed to find how entirely we could go along with him, and how true and valuable his meaning, as unfolded by himself, seemed to us. It comes in his discourse mainly to this, — that in the sight of God it is of infinitely more importance what we are than what we do, — that works are accepted on account of the worker, not the worker on account of works, — that no man can be reckoned good who is not good at heart, and that unless we can believe or trust in One who is able to transform our hearts, and be confident that He has exercised this power, all our doing, ceremonial or moral, will give us no real peace. This discourse of Luther is one of the few which would not fall dead upon the ear of a congregation should it be repeated in our day. It is clear and pithy, and brings out the vital principle in the matter, and commends this principle as neither an abstraction nor a trick, as in no wise arbitrary, but of everlasting and essential validity. We hope that no one will pass over this discourse from any prejudice which may be awakened by the title.

To the preacher who is bound to make a study of his art, this book must be of great value; the more so, perhaps, because it contains little which is likely to discourage a man of average abilities. To the common reader, it will be far more interesting than most volumes of Sermons, because it is a sort of practical Church history, and does virtually exhibit the different phases of Christian faith, whilst it brings to light whatever doctrines are really usable, and commended to us not only by the letter of Scripture, but also by the witness in the heart.

The Suffering Saviour ; or, Meditations on the Last Days of Christ. By FRED. W. KRUMMACHER, D. D., Chaplain to his Majesty the King of Prussia, Author of "Elisha the Tishbite," &c., &c. Translated, under the express Sanction of the Author, by SAMUEL JACKSON. Boston : Gould and Lincoln. 1856. 12mo. pp. 474.

WE hardly know what to write of this book, and perhaps it would be the wiser course not to write anything. It contains so much that is true, simple, tender, and touching, that we shall be sure to recur to its pages again and again, reading, as such a book should be read, a few chapters at a time, and allowing the words to speak to the heart, without much intermeddling of the intellect. Besides being a very careful and minute delineation of the closing scenes of the Saviour's life, — scenes upon which the religious mind dwells with so much interest, — it is a treasury of wise and devout thoughts, suggested to the disciple as he follows the Lord from the time when he announces the crucifixion that must come, to the interment in the tomb of Joseph. Nothing is omitted or slighted which can serve in any degree to bring out the significance of the Saviour's sufferings and death for the redemption of the world. Perhaps there is a little too much expansion of each topic, though indeed in this case each topic is rich in meaning. The three divisions of the work into "The Outer Court," "The Holy Place," and "The Most Holy Place," and the appropriate headings of the chapters, — as, for example, "The Announcement," "The Anointing," "Lord, is it I?" "The Traitor's Kiss," "Peter's Tears," — attract and aid the reader. The writer, moreover, avails himself of his opportunity to press many a moving question upon the infidelity by which he is surrounded, and appeals most effectively to the wants and aspirations of the human heart in argument for the necessity and truth of the Gospel. Thus much we cannot refrain from setting down in the way of commendation.

But there is another side. The theology of the book seems to be of the sort which is passing away, and which would be repudiated, so far as we can discover, by our New England Calvinists. Let the author's expressions touching the end and efficacy of the Saviour's death stand as truth in a mystery, as mystical words, and we can read them without much feeling of disapprobation, though they are pretty strong even at that ; but sift them down, and they are unallowable and painful. Moreover, we have been made sensible (and this has been a very frequent experience with us in reading what so-called Evangelical authors have written upon the atonement) of a hard tone breaking in continually upon the most tender strains, and of an appearance of a deliberate attempt upon the feelings, which is sure, when

recognized, to defeat itself. While, therefore, we like the book on the whole, it has strengthened our conviction that the lessons of the Saviour's sufferings and death are best set forth in chants and hymns, — those melodies of the heart which admit of so much freedom of expression, and do their work without calling in the aid of the understanding, with its logic and its definitions. If Christians could have been content with liturgies, and have refrained from creeds and catechisms, the Church would be more united than it is.

The Tangle-town Letters : being the Reminiscences, Observations, and Opinions of Timotheus Trap, Esq., including a Report of the Great Mammoth Reform Convention. Edited by the Author of "Records of the Bubbleton Parish," &c. Buffalo : Wanzler, McKene, & Co. 1856. 12mo. pp. 300.

A BROAD piece of satire, — so broad indeed that it amounts to a caricature, — devoted to exposing the follies and sins of our modern American society. The satirist, however, is a genial, humane man, in sympathy with some of the philanthropic movements of the day, an earnest lover of freedom, if not an advocate of "Woman's Rights," or disposed to put Christianity and Deism upon the same platform. The book is not without interest, but we must confess that the expectation awakened by the "Records of the Bubbleton Parish" has not been met, as we have turned over its pages.

Colomba. By PROSPER MÉRIMÉE. Translated from the French. Boston : Phillips, Sampson, & Co. 1856. 12mo. pp. 310.

"CORNICAN" Boswell's book of his experiences during his visit to General Paoli is not, we suppose, much read in these days, and *Colomba* will be especially attractive as affording us a glimpse into the life of the countrymen of the great Napoleon. The year 181— is the date of the story, and we believe that the extraordinary customs of the Corsicans remain what they then were. They are decidedly behind the times, for whilst we who boast of progress are abolishing the gallows, that "mark of civilization," the Corsican has not yet learned the use of this terror to evil-doers, but still takes his revenge in his own way, and resorts to *la vendetta* without judge or jury, betaking himself after this summary process to the *macchie*, the wide wastes covered

with underbrush and almost inaccessible to the gendarmes. In reading of these people one is reminded of the Book of Judges, albeit they are good Catholics. Each man does what is right in the sight of his own eyes, and each woman too, for our heroine, Colomba, is decidedly insane upon the subject of pistols and fusils. The odd contrasts supplied by the juxtaposition of barbarism and civilization add much to the entertainment of the reader. We are satisfied that Corsica must be a very uncomfortable place to live in, but it is pleasant to read about in this attractive little novel. The typography is in the best style of the enterprising and deservedly successful publishers.

Berenice. A Novel. Boston: Phillips, Sampson, & Co. 1856.

It is a tale of woman's trials, a novel in the form of an autobiography, and although not simple enough in its style for our taste, and marred by what seems to us affectation, not to say conceit, is not without merit. Through many passages of her life we have followed Berenice with much interest, especially in her brave struggles to maintain her independence and eat honest bread, and we congratulate her upon her restoration to her beautiful island-home.

Selections from Modern Greek Writers in Prose and Poetry.
With Notes, by C. C. FELTON, LL.D., Eliot Professor of
Greek Literature in Harvard University. Cambridge: John
Bartlett. 1856. 12mo. pp. 214.

THIS is one of the most valuable books which the indefatigable Professor of Greek at Harvard has given us; valuable not so much as a contribution to the world's literature as for the practical answer which it furnishes to a question that is ever coming up about the utility of classical studies, and the comparative claims of ancient and modern languages upon the young student. One ancient language, at least, turns out to be modern too, spoken with surprisingly slight changes in the east of Europe and the west of Asia, and the learned Hellenist may have been fitting himself to transact business with his mercantile correspondent and agent at Smyrna. We are satisfied that Greek will be studied ere long as a living tongue, and that, passing by the vexed question about the ancient pronunciation of the old language, we shall pronounce now as contemporary Grecians pronounce.

With the aid of some fifty pages of notes, (and these are very largely historical,) more than one hundred and fifty pages of Modern Greek are made intelligible to a proficient in the ancient tongue. We have not yet read the historical and oratorical extracts, and the poems, which make up the text of the volume; but a glance at the subjects and contents is sufficient to awaken a keen appetite for the perusal. We commend those who are in search of odd combinations to such phrases as "The Low Countries," "Charles the First," and "North America," rendered into Greek by Spyridon Tricoupēs, for some time Ambassador for Greece at the Court of St. James, and author of a History of the Greek Revolution.

The West Church and its Ministers. Fiftieth Anniversary of the Ordination of CHARLES LOWELL, D. D. Boston: Crosby, Nichols, & Co. 12mo. pp. 242.

THE West Church is nowhere in the neighborhood of the setting sun. Its ancient good name shows no sign of declension in our ecclesiastical sky. Its early love and stand for religious liberty are as distinguished at this moment as they were in the beginning. Its short but excellent line of ministers feels an accession of intellectual beauty and strength in the junior pastor, who here does the work of its historian.

We consider this volume one of the most valuable of those with which Mr. Bartol has favored us. Taking its start from the interesting solemnity mentioned at the head of this notice, it goes on to delineate, in three discourses, the characters and services of the three pastors who were the predecessors of Dr. Lowell. In fervid but discriminating words he brings before us brave William Hooper, who found the Boston churches of 1740 too straitened for his ideas of religious liberty; the noble patriot and liberal thinker, Jonathan Mayhew, who was generally thought by his ministerial brethren too heretical to be safe; and the amiable but steadfast Simeon Howard, stout for civil freedom and a generous theology, who was neither Trinitarian nor Calvinist, yet so earnest in the ministry of his faith as actually to float off the fragments of his church to the shores of Nova Scotia, when it had been broken up by the English soldiery, and its meeting-house was turned into a barrack.

There follows a discourse on "The Theological and Ecclesiastical Position of the West Church," which will command attention for the breadth of its views, and its wise, calm spirit, to say nothing of that charm of style, which seems to come spon-

taneously, and to invest the thoughts of this writer with full and pictured robes. This church has certainly one peculiarity, — and a very honorable one we think it, — that from its very foundation, one hundred and nineteen years ago, it has never been tainted by the Augustinian tenets, but has always been suspected or disallowed among those who boasted of their orthodoxy. We like it for that. It has always declined wearing any other denominational title than those of Christian and Congregational. We do not dislike it for that. But we may as well frankly confess, that we never had much sympathy with that zealous protestation against being called anything, in which some have taken pride to indulge. Perhaps the most manful way is neither to parade a name, nor to resent it. If we do not believe certain doctrines, we must believe what is the reverse of them, if we believe anything; and every preacher who preaches at all, must preach according to some ideas of truth and duty established in his mind. Let people give us what sectional names they choose. They will soon find out the right ones; and they are not likely from the first to be very far out of the way. A satire upon lawsuits, that was familiar to our childish days, has a passage which it may not be thought below dignity to repeat in this connection: "Now," said a droll barrister, "if this bull was of any color, he must have been of some color; and if he was of no color, of what color could this bull possibly be?" We do not mean that Mr. Bartol presses any point of this kind with undue zeal, or into any extravagances. He only goes for a free theology; and so do we. He only resists sectarian limitations; and we are with him on the farthest line of his protest. We cannot forbear quoting a period or two from this part of his book.

"Those who once thought the earth itself had a material basis, or that the crystal cope rested upon a boundless plain, might have trembled with terror at a sudden revelation to them of the round world swinging loose, and apparently unsupported, in the unpillared, measureless firmament. Yet further knowledge would persuade them that the gravitation of the boundless heavens is a support for this planetary dwelling stronger and more secure than any foundations below or columns above. So we can dispense with deriving from earthly standards the tendencies of our belief, and with ordering, at any human word of command, the motions of our reason and conscience which we keep spiritually connected with the inspiring Mind that made us, and humbly subject to the everlasting law of God."

The volume thus miscellaneously brought together, and abounding in details that must make it peculiarly precious to the religious society to whom it is devoted, has also no small historic importance, and an interest for our community at large.

Vassall Morton. A Novel. By FRANCIS PARKMAN, Author of "History of the Conspiracy of Pontiac," and "Prairie and Rocky-Mountain Life." Boston: Phillips, Sampson, & Co. 1856. 12mo. pp. 414.

THERE is quality in this. It springs from a vigorous and natural soil. It is honorably distinguished from most American novels, by its hearty manhood, its simple and honest strength. It draws its characters with discrimination, lets loose its dialogue with a ready freedom that yet never talks too much, and relates its incidents with admirable spirit. It never lags, is nowhere tedious, but presses to its purpose without halt or bend or any book-making inflations. Its perspicuous conciseness is one of its most striking characteristics. Its pages are broken up into no fewer than seventy-four chapters, each bearing its significant motto, each with its own completeness, and each advancing the general plan. It refrains from all superfluous words, though the practised ease of the writer shows that he has treasures of them in store. We note that what may be called the critical and reflective parts of the book, such as evidently portray the judgments and disposition of its author's mind, bear a wise proportion to the more stirring events of the narrative, and leave upon the mind of the reader a decided impression of respect.

Mr. Parkman has prepared himself for the work of a man of letters, which he seems determined to make real work, by a fine education earnestly followed up, by an eager acquaintance with nature and the more unwonted aspects of life, as well as with books and routine, and by hardy habits both of thought and outward activity. The stamp of this training is set upon all his works, which are never languid, timid, conventional, or commonplace. There is no affectation about them. He is bold, but his good taste keeps him from offensiveness and extravagance. His subjects, like his heart, are all American; and, without copying or imitation of any one else, he spreads them out with a venturesome but well-studied hand. His first considerable literary enterprise was "The Oregon Trail," of which the scenes were painted from his personal experience. "The History of the Conspiracy of Pontiac" followed; and whether we consider its diligent research or the spirited beauty of its style, we know of nothing in this kind of composition that has been done among our countrymen which deserves to be placed before it.

This story may seem to be but a diversion from more serious studies. Happy is he who can so recommend himself, and so interest and entertain others, by his recreations. The main action of the piece is carried on in places most familiar to us. New York and Boston and dear old Cambridge interchange on

its broad stage with the Alps, the Lake of Como, and the fortresses of Austrian despotism. We hear the peculiar talk of our own streets and country folks, together with slight sounds of the languages across the sea, but none of them to excess, as the bad custom of most writers both at home and abroad now is. There is but a touch and a hint, and enough is suggested. The volume, though soon read, comprises great variety, and ministers to many kinds of emotion. It has strokes of genial humor and of deepest passion, tones of the most ordinary life and the tramp of romantic adventure. The life that is in each different part is animated by a vivid temperament, and controlled by an overruling good sense; so that there is neither sentimentalism nor rant; what is most affecting is not strained too hard, and what is the most common is redeemed from being flat.

With these opinions, we commend the book to the public for a wholesome book, as well as a most engaging one. It will stir the feelings without turning them astray, without endangering the judgment or softening the will. No one's leisure will be wasted over pages that have so much culture and so much purpose in them. And we ought to add, in speaking of such qualities, that Mr. Parkman has gone on writing under circumstances that would have utterly deterred a less impulsive talent or a less brave resolution. His eyes have long suffered from some chronic malady; and the eyes would seem almost indispensable to the highest success of literary researches, were it not for the example to the contrary with which another of our townsmen has managed to charm the whole studious world. The fact would not be mentioned in this new instance of perseverance, were it not that difficulties enhance the merit of whatever is well performed in spite of them; and were it not also for the courageous lesson which they read to the rest of mankind.

The Poetical Works of ALFRED TENNYSON, *Poet Laureate, etc.*

Complete in one volume. Boston: Ticknor and Fields.

1856. 16mo. pp. 518.

A REAL pocket edition of Tennyson, printed with good, plain type, upon fair paper, and in very tasteful binding, must be admitted to be the very *vade mecum* of all others for our summer rambles, and our sojournings on the hill-sides and by the way of the sea. We should have said that Tennyson could not be compressed into so small space without crowding, but we find everything, including that sweetest, saddest of modern poems, the "*In Memoriam*." The publishers as well as the poet will be gratefully remembered under many a green tree and great rock, whilst Sirius has most things his own mad way.

The Piazza Tales. By HERMAN MELVILLE, Author of "Typee," "Omoo," &c., &c. New York: Dix and Edwards. 1856. 12mo. pp. 431.

MR. MELVILLE having introduced us, in the first score or more of pages, to the piazza of his residence, amongst the hills of our glorious Berkshire, and having awakened in the reader a deep longing to gaze with him upon the sublime and lovely scenery which his words paint so well, or to roam with him to the lonely hut of the coal-burner and his sister on the mountain-side, strikes out into the great city of our Union, and over the seas, and reels off five yarns of narrative which will accomplish all they aim at, namely, the amusement of his readers, — an object for which, as well as for everything else, there is a time.

The Spanish Conquest in America, and its Relation to the History of Slavery and to the Government of Colonies. By ARTHUR HELPS. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1856. 2 vols. 12mo. pp. 960.

THE praise which this work has received in the English journals and reviews has led to its republication in the United States as a standard work. If its sale here is measured by its attractiveness, it will not be very large. It is a diffuse and tedious narrative, — so tedious that its merits are hardly worth the trouble of the discovery. The pictures of scenery are faint and hazy, the portraits of men are never striking, and the whole story goes as languidly on as a party of pleasure in a Turkish *café*. The material is abundant, the arrangement judicious, the design amiable, but the execution seems to us very feeble. Mr. Helps has a quiet sort of humor, and says occasionally a good thing by the way, but seems to be wanting in energy of thought, as he certainly is in energy of style. To compare his volumes with those of Prescott and Irving, is simply absurd. We might as well compare Bartlett's History of the United States with Bancroft, or the Penny Magazine with Hume and Macaulay. The ostensible purpose of Mr. Helps is to show how the Spaniards planted slavery in America. But he leaves no definite impression about slavery and the slave-trade. He states that he has been "*singularly fortunate* in the number of friends who have taken an almost paternal interest in the book, and who have aided me by advice, criticism, research, and co-operation." It is to be regretted that these friends were not able to impart more vigor to the style, more unity to the treatment, more of the qualities which make a book readable.

The very numerous maps which are scattered along the pages would be an important aid in a well-written work on this subject. But here they are of very little use, and seem provokingly intrusive. They only help to break up a narrative already broken by digressions, retrospections, and allusions to something to come. Mr. Helps is one of those writers who seem never to finish as they intended what they begin to say, who are beguiled away from their main path by tempting side reflections, and leave their readers in the end unsatisfied and bewildered, laughing, perhaps, at some odd observation, but quite uncertain where they left the theme in hand. The industry, the fairness, and the comprehensiveness of his research in preparing his work deserve all praise. It is a pity that the other qualities of an historian were not joined to these. The work must be classed with those numerous historical treatises of which the chief merit is the labor of their compilation and their excellent intention. It is worth relatively about as much as Menzel's History of German Literature.

Memoirs, Journal, and Correspondence of THOMAS MOORE.

Edited by the Right Hon. LORD JOHN RUSSELL, M. P. Vols. VII. and VIII. Boston: Little, Brown, & Co. 1856. 12mo. pp. 378, 376.

THE Ex-Premier here completes his labor of love as executor and friend in presenting the Memorials of Moore. We suppose the work has been done as well as it could have been done, and we are sure that it has been done in full conformity with the deserts of its subject. We have now eight volumes of a very miscellaneous character, all more or less interesting, and some of it quite so, covering the whole literary and social life of the poet. Lord John has been the butt of critics all through his extended task; but he appears to have cared little for their spite, and less for their suggestions. He has done his work in his own way, and deserves the credit of a kind intent and of a patient labor in a not altogether inviting undertaking. The materials now in full before us suggest an article on Moore which we may hope to furnish garnished with some of the better flavored extracts from these eight attractive volumes. In the mean while, as we have recently had something to say about Coleridge which his admirers have visited with what they intended as a rebuke, we will here offer them a nut for the cracking.

Mr. Moore speaks, on the seventh and eighth pages of the seventh volume of his "Memoirs," of a conversation with Coleridge, in which he shows no great liking, and indeed a very

manifest mistrust, of that famous *prôneur*. He says: "He is employed, it seems, in writing on Daniel and the Revelations; and his notions on the subject, as far as they were at all intelligible, appeared to be a strange mixture of rationalism and mysticism. Thus, with the rationalists, he pronounced the gift of tongues to have been nothing more than scholarship, or a knowledge of different languages; said that this was the opinion of Erasmus, as may be deduced from his referring to Plato's *Timæus* on the subject. (Must see to this.)"

Now, when he came to *see to it*, he unquestionably saw that there was not a word of truth in anything he had been listening to. It was all pretension. He would discover this "opinion of Erasmus" when he discovered that "writing on Daniel and the Apocalypse,"—and also the reference to "Plato's *Timæus*" at the same time. Indeed, if Plato could have written anything touching an event that took place nearly four hundred years after he was dead, he must have been even a more "divine" man than his most worshipful admirers have ever supposed him to be. We are inclined to think, that if any one, reversing the better method of induction, should set out with the hypothesis that Mr. Coleridge was one of the most remarkable charlatans in British letters and philosophy, he would find a great variety of facts in singular agreement with such a theory.

INTELLIGENCE.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

THE press continues to pour forth a stream of publications of which we must take note, not merely according to their value, but also as we have time to examine them. Of some of the works whose titles we proceed to give, we must hope by and by to offer a more adequate notice.

Messrs. Crosby, Nichols, & Co. have already published the "second thousand" of Professor Huntington's volume of "Sermons for the People." These fervent and earnest discourses invite and reward perusal, because of the fresh vigor and glowing heartiness of conviction and purpose which are their marked characteristics. In some points they are open to criticism, which, however, we would not offer hastily. There is now-a-days so much tame and aimless preaching, which, of course, is ineffective, as it ought to be, that we would not abate our high and grateful appreciation of any discourses which quicken the Christian life in cold hearts, by objecting to some phrases, sentences, or even shapings of thought on great doctrinal points, that may not accord with our own taste or convictions.

The American Unitarian Association is zealously pursuing its wisely arranged plan of publishing and circulating several series of volumes adapted to the exposition and vindication of a pure Christianity, and to the great objects of Christian growth in character and life. Its last publication is a new edition of Mr. Norton's *Statement of Reasons for not believing the Doctrines of Trinitarians concerning the Nature of God and the Person of Christ*. This edition contains some additions and corrections which the author left in an interleaved copy of the work, besides some valuable Notes by the scholarly editor, Ezra Abbot, Jr., and the biographical notice of Mr. Norton which appeared in our own pages in 1853. This work of Mr. Norton's has been depreciated and disesteemed, as well as misrepresented, by some professed critics, who have found it easier to deal with it in that manner than to answer its argument. In some minor points his positions may be fairly disputed, but we are firmly persuaded that in his leading assertions, and in the strong and thoroughly reasoned grounds by which they are supported, the work has not been answered, and cannot be invalidated.

Messrs. Little, Brown, & Co. continue their highly popular series of the *British Poets*, and of the *British Essayists*, in the same size and form, and find in their wide circulation an adequate motive for carrying on the enterprise to the promised completion. Three volumes, containing *The Rambler*, make the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth of the series of the *Essayists*, and the *Poems of Shakespeare*, in one volume, and those of Robert Herrick, in two volumes, extend the series of the *Poets*.

Messrs. Gould and Lincoln publish, in a translation from the German of Biernatzki by Mrs. George P. Marsh, a tale of humble life on the coast of Schleswig, under the title of "*The Hallig, or the Sheepfold in the Waters*." The physical circumstances and the social usages of the life portrayed in the volume give it a charm to jaded readers. The interest of the story is strong and natural, but its theology, in the main true, in some points questionable, is designed by the author to convey its great moral.

Messrs. Ticknor and Fields have published in a neat form *Lectures* by the late Professor E. T. Channing, read in the course of his duty before successive Senior Classes at Harvard for a long series of years. R. H. Dana, Jr. offers us, in his editorial capacity, an excellent and grateful *Biographical Notice of the Professor*. We hope that as many more classes of students will improve the opportunity put within their reach by these *Lectures*, of receiving the mature wisdom of this master of a chaste English style.

The same publishers have issued a new edition of Allston's beautiful Italian tale of "*Monaldi*."

Messrs. Phillips, Sampson, & Co. have published a new *Memoir of the Character and Labors of that devoted Missionary, Adoniram Judson*, by Mrs. H. C. Conant. The first and very appropriate title of the volume is "*The Earnest Man*." Dr. Wayland's *Memoir of Judson*, of which we spoke in high commendation, and extracts from which we transferred to our pages, has found a very extensive circulation, and the readers of it have craved still another memorial of a faithful Christian laborer. Mrs. Conant's book is worthy of its subject.

The same publishers have issued "The New Age, or the Life and Adventures of Robert Dexter Romaine, written by himself." The reader must peruse this charming volume in the full faith that it is a veritable record of actual, personal experiences, and he will find it delightful occupation for summer hours.

In a volume published by Redfield, New York, Mr. Evert A. Duyckinck has made the best possible use of all the publications by and about the late Rev. Sydney Smith. He has extracted the "Wit and Wisdom" of that humorous divine's Sermons, Essays, Review Articles, Letters, and Table-Talk, and given us a Memoir and Notes of his own. The plan was a most judicious one, and it has been most felicitously executed.

"The Daisy Chain, or Aspirations," is the title of a new story, in two volumes, by the author of "The Heir of Redclyffe," published by D. Appleton & Co., New York. The well-deserved popularity of the author in many circles of readers not always interested in the same class of books, will attract them as it does ourselves to this work, with pleasing anticipations of interest and profit from its perusal.

The same publishers have reprinted, from the third London edition, a volume on the Rise and Progress of the English Constitution, by E. S. Creasy. The book is full of instruction presented in a condensed form, and perfectly reliable upon that unwritten but actual basis of government, the English Constitution, which lives not by *Articles*, but by *Principles*.

"The Philosophy of the Weather, and a Guide to its Changes," is the title of another work issued by the same firm, from the pen of Mr. T. B. Butler. This volume is highly instructive, and contains a vast deal of information upon a topic which concerns us all. The author does not pretend to be wise beyond the bounds of common sense and science, but he is wise within them, and so can afford to dispense with the sciolism and quackery of prophetic claims, and confine himself within his own bounds of fair induction.

Messrs. Derby and Jackson, of New York, publish "The Adventures of Gerard, the Lion-Killer; comprising a History of his Ten Years' Campaign among the Wild Animals of Northern Africa. Translated from the French by Charles E. Whitehead,"—a book of wild life for man as well as beasts, and wonderfully illustrating some of the traits common to both those classes of the creatures of God.

The same firm issue "Gabriel Vane, his Fortune and his Friends, by Jeremy Loud,"—a pleasantly written tale, suited to a milder taste in readers.

Messrs. G. P. Putnam & Co., of New York, have undertaken to publish, under the general title of "The Modern Story-Teller, or The Best Stories of the Best Authors," a series of volumes whose contents shall answer to that description. The design is a happy one, and is admirably carried out in the first volume, which is now before us. The editor, following the popular testimony, which is distinct and accordant enough to guide a judicious and independent mind, has made an excellent selection with which to inaugurate his undertaking.